LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
MAY 26 1930
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BV 2060 .W27 1929
Wark, Homer Ethan, 1875-
A new era in missions

A NEW ERA IN MISSIONS

A New Era In Missions

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
MAY 26 1930
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

By
HOMER E. WARK, PH. D.
President, West Virginia Wesleyan College,
Buckhannon, West Virginia

FOREWORD BY
BISHOP HERBERT WELCH, LL.D.
Of the Methodist Episcopal Church

NEW YORK CHICAGO
Fleming H. Revell Company
LONDON AND EDINBURGH

Copyright, MCMXXIX, by
FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY

New York: 158 Fifth Avenue
Chicago: 851 Cass Street
London: 21 Paternoster Square
Edinburgh: 99 George Street

FOREWORD

HAVING been permitted to see the manuscript of my friend, President Wark, I am happy to have the privilege of writing a word of introduction to so admirable a book.

Dr. Wark has had experience which qualifies him in an unusual degree for such a discussion as is contained in this volume. He has lived and preached in a mission land, he has taught the history of religion in an American university, he has been a world-traveller and enjoyed opportunities for intelligent observation of Christian work in many countries. This product of his pen, therefore, while scholarly, is saved from being academic or abstruse. It is based not merely on a study of available literature but on first-hand contact with field realities.

No teacher of missions, no writer upon this high theme, in these days can avoid questions which are fundamental to the very continued existence and power of Christianity itself. The author of this book has not sought to avoid them. Implicit throughout, the problems of the universality and finality of the Christian religion are directly brought to the front in the later chapters. The whole matter of world missions depends upon one's Christology. Who is Jesus Christ? is the query which one ultimately must face.

If Jesus Christ is He whom we have believed Him to be, foreign missions are imperative; if He is not, they are absurd. This critical point Dr. Wark does

not ignore. Every man has his own emphasis and his own way of putting things; and doubtless some will not be in complete sympathy with every phrase or turn of the author. But with his point of view, his method of approach, and his general conclusions, it is easy to find oneself in hearty agreement. His book is comprehensive, fair, modern, reverent, and strong especially in its treatment of missionary aims. It seems to me thoroughly worth while, and I trust it may be widely read and studied. Its influence should be enlightening, wholesome, and tonic.

HERBERT WELCH.

Pittsburgh, Pa.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 11

I. THE VALIDITY OF THE MISSIONARY IDEA IN RELIGION 30
1. The Missionary Idea in Other Than the Religious Sphere 30
2. The " Open Door " Policy in Religion 34
3. The Missionary and Non-Missionary Religions. 36
4. The Bearing of Missions on Vital Religion.... 39
5. Bearing of Missions on International Relations. 43
6. Conclusion 45

II. MISSIONARY MOTIVES 47
1. Introduction 47
1. The Task Defined 47
2. The Explanation of Its Enemies..... 48
3. A Powerful Motive Needed..... 48
4. Various Missionary Motives..... 49
2. Historical Survey 51
1. The Missionary Motive in St. Paul..... 51
2. The Missionary Motive in the Early Church 52
3. Missionary Motives in the Middle Ages... 54
4. The Missionary Motive in the Later Catholic Missions 57
5. Motives in Early Protestantism..... 60
3. Some Motives Not Generally Operative..... 62
1. The Return of Christ to Reign on the Earth 63

2. Pity for the Doomed Heathen..... 63
3. The Deluded Heathen..... 65
4. Missionary Motives in Recent Times (Protestantism) 66
1. The Political Motive (Nationalism)..... 67
2. The Ecclesiastical Motive..... 69
3. The Philanthropic Motive (The Need of the World) 71
4. The Spiritual Motive..... 75

III. Essential Missionary Aims 81
1. Introductory Statement of the Problem..... 81
2. Some Negative Aspects of Missions..... 81
1. Not to Carry Western Theology..... 81
2. Not to Carry Western Ecclesiasticism..... 84
3. Not to Carry Western Civilization..... 86
3. A Constructive Statement of Fundamental Missionary Aims 91
Aim No. 1: The Evangelization of the World 91
(1) What Does the Term Evangelization Mean? 91
(a) The Heralding Theory 91
(b) The Planting Theory 92
(2) The Stages of Missionary Work Suggested by Great Commission..... 95
(3) Evangelization of the World in This Generation 98
Aim No. 2: The Raising Up of an Indigenous Church 100
Aim No. 3: The Ideal of Spiritual Interpenetration 104
Aim No. 4: The Naturalization of Christianity in All Non-Christian Countries... 112

Aim No. 5: A World Dominated by Christian Standards of Life..... 125
Aim No. 6: An International Christianity.... 132

IV. The Uniqueness of Christianity..... 139

V. The Finality of Christianity..... 149

VI. Christianity and Other Religions..... 160

INTRODUCTION

WE live in a revolutionary age. Startling changes have come in our time along social, political, and religious lines. The historian of the future will likely refer to the years following the World War as revolutionary years. Christianity has been compelled to reckon with the new spirit and the new ideals of these post-war years. The Church has everywhere found these difficult years.

Men may properly ask whether, in the midst of all the changes, there is anything unchanging in the Church's creed or its obligations? Is the Church also the victim of the revolution? Is it compelled to shift from one position to another because of changing conditions throughout the world?

In no part of its work has the Church been so sorely disconcerted as in its foreign mission program. That there is the greatest confusion about this program, no one can doubt. There is not merely a deadly indifference about missions, but a confessed disillusionment on the part of many pastors and church leaders. Many doubt whether there is a missionary obligation. Many are inclined to accept the views now industriously promoted by leaders of the Orient to the effect that the whole program is indefensible. On all sides we are told that the situation has changed; that it is not clear whether or not the Church should embark on such an undertaking; that under the criticism of the hour we cannot defend our movement; that it is altogether a

question whether we should proceed any farther with the enterprise. Now such an attitude accords well with the selfish spirit of the day and gives a sense of relief from serious obligation. However, many who are in confusion on the issue are seriously striving for light and still feel the Church has a definite missionary obligation.

One of the purposes of this volume is to show that the changing social and political conditions either at home, or in the mission lands, do not alter or vacate the deep responsibility of the Church to preach Christ to all men and to urge their acceptance of Him as the Lord of all life. Surely the changing conditions do not change or abate our obligations to make Him known to the whole world. Moreover, it is the purpose to define our aims and to discover the abiding motives of missionary activity. As will appear, these motives are spiritual and are not affected by external conditions at home or elsewhere throughout the world. If serious difficulties were an excuse for missionary indifference, then the Church would never have travelled far in its conquest of the world. Its history shows that missionary advance has been secured in most centuries at fearful cost and in the face of heavy odds. Admittedly, conditions are difficult today in most lands. In some cases, advance seems impossible. But the great missionaries have always faced such conditions and have been spurred on to greater activities and more profound consecration and prayer by the difficulties they faced. Surely the Church of today will not be cowardly, in the face of vast problems and what seems like insurmountable difficulties.

It must appear upon examination that the missionary idea is a fundamental idea in Christianity; that

Christianity is irrevocably a missionary religion; that at its heart there is the undying urge to make all men acquainted with Christ; and that whenever it loses that inward urge to evangelism, its life and power has gone. It may appear that other than the true inward and spiritual motive has constrained us in our age. Perhaps we have thought far too much of outward conditions. Possibly our appeal has mostly been a humanitarian appeal. There is the greatest necessity that we get back of the external factors to the deep, abiding incentive which arises in the hearts of all those who have come into personal fellowship with God in Christ. There is need of careful thinking if the Church is to regain a sense of obligation in missions. There has been much shallow thinking and writing on the subject. We have employed journalists with a gift for publicity but who have known little of the question in hand to formulate our literature. We have had more faith in nimble pens than in clear understanding of the issues. We are now at the place where journalistic skill alone will not suffice. The thinkers and scholars of the Church must now show us the way out of our difficulty. The abiding factors in the missionary urge must be discovered and presented so that every intelligent Christian can understand them.

From Edinburgh to Jerusalem

One of the best ways of discovering how great are the changes which have come over the missionary world in recent years is to compare the findings of the Edinburgh Conference of 1910 with the findings of the Jerusalem Conference in 1928. Turning back to discover what the vital issues were in the Edinburgh gathering, we can select the following items: The burn-

ing issue of that Conference was, "What is the Christian message we are to preach?" and secondly, "What is the method of approach to the various religionists?" or "How can the message be adapted to Hindus, Buddhists, etc.?" Further, this Conference was dimly conscious that the Gospel carried was a Western form of Christianity, and it was beginning to doubt whether such a Gospel could be transplanted. However, the question of Western creeds, ecclesiasticism, and civilization was hardly acute in their minds. The problems centreing around these issues were only on the horizon. That Conference saw the need of a vast army of missionaries. How to secure and train these missionaries occupied their thought. The question of money was paramount, for the program they envisaged called for a very large pocketbook. In only a remote fashion did that Conference visualize the intense racial prejudice, the rising tide of nationalism, the spread of Western industrialism, the issue of war or peace, or the issue of Imperialism by Western powers, which confront us today.

The Jerusalem Conference shows how clearly missionary advance is tied up with the vital questions of our age. The reports read and discussed at that Conference had to do with the growing industrialism of the Orient, the growing race tension in many lands, and the demand of the Orient for racial equality, the question of war and peace; what stand the missionary force of the world should take on the issue of national protection by soldiers and gunboats; the whole issue of Western economic exploitation of the weaker races of the world; the whole diplomatic procedure and policy of Western nations; the recognition of the nationalistic spirit in most of the lands where missionaries work and

how far missionaries should accord with these national aspirations. All of these issues were squarely faced at Jerusalem. They were scarcely before the minds of those who gathered in Edinburgh in 1910.

One is compelled to wonder whether the Jerusalem Conference should be called a missionary conference. In reading the report, one would hardly know whether it was a group of people primarily interested in missions or a group of social reformers. They were intensely conscious of the evils which afflict the world. One does not find evidence of the intense missionary passion which prevailed at Edinburgh. Nor does one gather that this group possessed the confidence of the Conference of 1910. The findings and reports of the Jerusalem meeting will not meet with an enthusiastic reception in the churches. No little confusion will result from this attempt to relate missions to all our world problems. It is, however, this attempt to relate the enterprise to the whole world problem which gives the report uniqueness and importance.

The New Forces Which Make New Methods and Programmes Imperative

The report will be a disappointment as a succinct statement of our motives, aims, and policies in missions. But it is ample evidence of the vast changes which have overtaken the missionary world. The great question it raises is that raised by our recent Conferences—Can the missionary movement broaden out and take account of our whole world situation, the moral, political, economic, and diplomatic problems, and maintain itself as a missionary enterprise in any special sense?

It is not contended here that changed conditions in

the world have nothing to do with missions. We have so far merely asserted that a changing world does not abrogate the missionary obligation of the Church. We have insisted that there are abiding factors in the missionary urge. No matter what happens in the politics of the world, the economic life of the world, or the social life of the world, the urge to evangelism abides. This is enduring and constant in the hearts of all who commune with God through Jesus Christ. However, our methods, our programmes, and our policies will be vitally affected by the changed conditions under which missionaries work. It is, therefore, of signal importance that we try to understand the changes that have come, and to foresee, if possible, those yet to come.

Within the last quarter of a century we have witnessed a vast reversal of opinion and attitude among the peoples of the Orient as well as among the peoples of the Occident. The Orient has reversed itself with respect to the Occident, and the Occident has reversed itself with respect to the Orient.

The first and most sweeping change in the mind of the Orient is its complete reversal as to the values of Western civilization. There are missionaries still alive today who can recall the curious interest of the Oriental peoples in Western civilization. The opinion then prevailed that things Western were mostly all superior to things Eastern. There was a live interest in all Western inventions, discoveries, social institutions, forms of government, and literary products. The opinion prevailed that things Eastern were not only belated, but inferior. In those days missionaries found it convenient not only to assert the superiority of Western civilization as a whole, but to claim that the superiority was due to Christianity. In this position they

were not far from the truth, though perhaps this argument was overworked. But today such an argument by a missionary is useless. The Oriental peoples will no longer hear of the superiority of Western civilization. The World War accounts for this conversion in part, but only in part. The War was a despicable sight, indeed. Most of the nominally Christian nations were engaged in it. Before it ended, nearly all of the non-Christian nations were engaged in it. Orientals might blame the Western States for beginning the War, but they soon joined in it for reasons similar to the Western States. The Oriental races did not have conviction enough to stay out of it. Wherever any advantage was offered, they entered the lists also. However, the leaders of the Orient felt then that the War was a revelation as to the worthlessness of Western civilization. A still smaller number believed that it also revealed the failure of Christianity. Perhaps very few insist on the latter point now. The fact to be noted is that Westerners are everywhere put on the defensive today. Orientals certainly do not accept Western civilization as superior to Eastern civilization, and this makes the way of the missionary much more difficult than it once was. It is not necessary for me, at this point, to answer this contention, though I feel that in measure it can be answered. The present antipathy for Western civilization is quite largely prejudice. It is really better than many assert it to be. A reaction from this extreme point of view is nearly due. When the Orientals are further removed from the War, and when they take a broader and a less antagonistic attitude, they will also agree that Western civilization has many values.

It was inevitable that sooner or later the Orient

would discover the iniquities of Western life and exploit them. This would have happened without the World War. We are much better informed about each other than we were a few years ago. The life of each nation is an open book. The War only focussed the attention of the world more suddenly on the weaknesses in Western civilization. They would have been discovered without the War.

There can be no doubt that this discovery of the cancerous spots in our social and political life has made a vast difference with the Christian movement. We are compelled to acknowledge these cancerous spots and be humbled by them. However, when seen in the right perspective, this does not abate our obligation to carry on mission work in other lands. It does make that work more difficult. As Christians we are not set to the task of defending Western civilization. We are committed to the task of making Christ known to men in every land, regardless of the state of civilization. It follows, of course, that we must do all we can to transform our Western civilization. But it must not be forgotten that the evils which afflict our American life are common to other nations, Christian and non-Christian alike, and can only find complete abatement in America, when abatement comes elsewhere. Most of the evils that afflict society are international in scope and must be dealt with internationally. War, industrialism, imperialism, race-prejudice, and super-nationalism, are all issues calling for international treatment.

Likewise there has been a vast reversal across the Orient in respect to the racial superiority of the Westerners. In the early days of missions, the white man

was regarded as a kind of superior individual. The peoples of the Orient seemed to accept this as a fact, though one wonders what their deeper inward thoughts were even in those early days. The achievements of Western races seemed greater than the Eastern races. There was as yet little disposition to question this conclusion. So long as the missionary was regarded as belonging to a superior race, as well as a superior civilization, his way was easy. But gradually there came an awakening of a profound sort. The deep springs of racial feeling were unloosed. For the past twenty-five years there has been an insistent demand for racial equality. There was much in the diplomacy of Western nations to remind the Orientals of their inferiority. Immigration laws mostly rested on the assumption of inferiority and non-assimilation with white races. Perhaps the majority of Nordics still believe this heresy. As a result, race tension has developed all over the world, even among races which have very little to divide them. One of the vital questions of the age is that of relieving racial tension. The strain is so great in some quarters that another world war might be precipitated.

In theory, all Christians believe in the equality of the races before God. But our actions often belie our creed. Even missionaries have often sinned at this point. This would be no place to discuss the issue of the equality of races, or the questions related to the problems such as inter-racial marriages, the assimilation or non-assimilation of Oriental races with white races, or what a just immigration law would be. It is very certain this is a world issue of prodigious proportions. The missionary is now everywhere working with people with pronounced race consciousness, and

which no longer accept the doctrine of white superiority. The meaning of this to the missionary is evident. The bearing of this issue on missionary policy is also evident.

Another factor of supreme importance is the presence of an intense national consciousness on the part of most peoples among whom we work. It will be apparent that the factors we have discussed, namely, white superiority and the superiority of Western civilization, are closely linked up with this factor of nationalism. The whole phenomenon of nationalism cannot be discussed here. It is our purpose here to point out the fact that the rise of nationalism in nearly all mission lands has greatly altered the task of missionaries. Nationalism is tied up with similarity of race, unity in culture, oneness of language and religious history. Different factors appear and control in different countries. The essence of nationalism is the sense of nationhood, and the intense emotional reaction—"This is my native land, and these are my people." Whatever may be the component parts of the nationalistic spirit, the phenomenon itself is of supreme importance.

The situation in India or China today cannot be understood without a proper evaluation of this nationalistic emotion. Any attempt to disregard this spirit will be suicidal. The best policy is to recognize the presence of this spirit and to act accordingly. At heart we may dislike the intense patriotism of these peoples. It might be easy to show that it leads to foolish and destructive policies. But we must never lose sight of the fact that this emotion of patriotism is very real and very powerful in these peoples. We are not without something of the same feeling toward our own

country, and we cannot therefore deny the feeling to other peoples.

Nationalism is one of the necessary steps on the road to international interest and outlook. It is to be hoped that the fervid nationalism of European and American States is soon to be softened and tempered, and is to give place to a reasonable nationalism on the one hand and a true international consciousness on the other. We may entertain this hope for the Orient as well. It will be some years before this spirit reaches its peak in some of these lands and still more years before it will pass. In the meantime, it will greatly alter our approach to these people in the preaching of Jesus Christ. In order to succeed among strongly nationalistic peoples, we need to be divested of our own strong national feelings, and only as we are able to rise above nationalism into a true international interest and outlook will we be able to serve these peoples.

Finally we have to note the rise of a self-conscious church in the mission fields, and to point out that this is one of the disturbing factors in the changed situation. It will immediately be apparent that this factor is tied up with those we have discussed, but especially to the nationalistic factor just mentioned. Many missionaries are worried over the churches which have grown up through their efforts, and which they have guided across many years. These churches are their children. They feel toward them as a parent feels toward a child. Today the child is self-willed, wants freedom and independence, and does not willingly listen to the advice of the parent. The churches have come to maturity; they contain many potential and would-be leaders. There is no little ambition for place and honour among the leaders. They refuse to be led

by a foreigner. They are of age. Today many of them are not only breaking away from the missionaries out of whose labours they have grown, but are breaking away from the denominations in whose laps they have been nurtured. They seek to find fellowship with other nationals, though of a different denomination. An ecclesiastical name or fold is not as much to them as the national spirit which burns in their bones. In many cases they are joining national church organizations. The spirit of the nation possesses them, and they reveal it in the management of their churches. Many of the pastors are said to preach patriotism more ardently than they preach the Gospel of Christ.

To much of this, legitimate objection might be taken, but it will be of little use. Nor will we be consistent in refusing them freedom of action. We will remind ourselves that we, too, are nationally minded. Patriotism is a considerable factor in our religion. In the early days of the Republic various denominations severed their connections with mother churches in Europe and established their own American denominations. They demanded complete freedom religiously as well as politically. Can we severely censure Christian Methodists, Baptists, or Presbyterians who take the same course in China, Japan, or India?

Whether their course is the best possible course is hardly an essential issue. For us here in America the main thing is to recognize and understand the mind of these Christian brethren in the Orient. We dare not try to override their ambition for freedom, nor to try to assume that their ambition is not real. We must recognize the fact we are confronted with and form our policies in view of it. The makers of missionary strategy for tomorrow will not overlook any of these

factors. They are very real, and to disregard them will be to fail in all our efforts. However, these untoward factors, if such they be, are not good reasons for deserting the missionary enterprise. Much less do they abate our obligation to carry Jesus Christ into their midst.

There has been a very insistent demand that missionaries take a stand on these issues and on certain vital questions closely related. The issue of imperialism, with the accompanying exploitation of weaker races; the use of soldiers and gunboats to protect missionaries and their properties; the part played by members of the Christian States in the growing industrialism of the Orient; the attitude of the Christian States in reference to immigration; the question of unjust treaties as in China, and whether such treaties shall now be rewritten—these constitute vital questions in the Orient, and every missionary is forced to take a position on them.

This demand has largely been met by the Jerusalem Conference, which took a stand and made a pronouncement on all these questions. It remains to be seen whether this statement will clear the air or not. There will likely be much doubt left as to whether the Christian churches back of the small group in Jerusalem really mean to stand squarely on these and other questions.

One thing is certain, and that is that missionary work among the intelligentsia of the Orient will be greatly handicapped until the Christian people of the West take up a Christian position on these issues.

It is certainly interesting to observe that while these momentous social and psychological changes are taking

place in the Orient, our own attitude toward the Orient and Oriental achievements has undergone radical change also. The West has had to reverse itself very radically on a number of issues. First of all as to the capacities and character of Oriental races. The earliest white men to visit the Orient were inclined to rate these races very low indeed. We now know that such races as the Hindus, the Chinese, and the Japanese are as capable in general as white races. We know that each of these races has produced many great men. Of their present ability to rule themselves and to compete in commerce, in art, and literature, there is little room for doubt. But it is in relation to their cultural achievements especially that we of the West have been forced to change our minds. One hundred years ago most white men agreed with Lord Macaulay in believing that the cultural inheritance of Oriental peoples was practically worthless. In his celebrated report to his Government in Calcutta, in 1835, on an educational program for India, he said: "I have never found one among them (the Oriental scholars) who could deny that a single shelf of a good European library was worth the whole native literature of India and Arabia." (See Paton's *Life of Duff*, p. 97.) In justice, it ought to be said that he was answering a few Western scholars who had found value in the literature of the East, and who were opposed to his recommendation. But, generally speaking, his statement expressed the conviction which was common among white men in the East. This disparaging estimate of Eastern culture has been held by most white people in the East down until recent years. Even missionaries held it rather generally. There was little disposition to appreciate properly the literature, the art, the sculpture, the architecture, or the

religions of the East. In late years all this is changing. Many Western people are now inclined to go over to the other extreme and offer an exaggerated estimate of their culture. Someone qualified for the task could render a fine piece of service by giving us a comparative study in cultural values. The point we here desire to make is that, in a true sense, we have reversed ourselves as to cultural values among Oriental peoples.

The one point at which this reversal is extremely important is in the field of religions. Until rather recently most missionaries were inclined to disparage the ancient religious systems of the East. For long years the majority held that these systems were inventions of the devil or the product of uninspired men. At best they were an imitation of the truth in Christianity and were calculated to deceive their devotees. It is difficult for those of us who have been in contact with these systems as they are today, and who have some knowledge of their sacred books, to understand how intelligent men could have been so prejudiced and mistaken. In recent years many have come in contact with these literatures through translations or through the original tongues, and their contents are becoming known. What we now know is that many of the religious ideas we are accustomed to are to be found in these sacred books. We begin to realize that these books were produced not by the inspiration of devils, but by the inspiration of God's Holy Spirit, which has brooded over these nations as well as over the Hebrews and Christians. We now begin to see that God has nowhere left Himself without a witness. So we are reconciled to finding much valuable truth in these religious books of the Orient.

There is frank recognition of the value of these

faiths to those who hold them. The Jerusalem Conference has the following statement which illustrates the attitude of Western leaders toward the ancient religions of the East: "Thus, merely to give illustration, and making no attempt to estimate the spiritual value of other religions to their adherents, we recognize as part of *the one truth,* that sense of the majesty of God and the consequent reverence in worship which are conspicuous in Islam; the deep sympathy for the world's sorrow and unselfish search for the way of escape which are at the heart of Buddhism; the desire for contact with Ultimate Reality conceived as spiritual, which is prominent in Hinduism; the belief in a moral order of the Universe and consequent insistence on moral conduct, which are inculcated in Confucianism; the disinterested pursuit of truth and of human welfare which are often found in those who stand for secular civilization, but do not accept Christ as their Lord and Saviour." (See *Message and Recommendations,* p. 14.)

This statement is both conservative and indefinite, but it is a recognition of values in these systems, and however general it is, it is very significant as indicating the changed attitude to the non-Christian religions.

Such a concession on the part of missionaries creates perhaps the most difficult problems we now face. At once we are compelled to ask what is our attitude toward these devotees? What do we expect to do for them? Do we recognize these systems as essentially satisfactory or sufficient? Do we still desire to convert them in the sense of having them take the Christian name, or might we be willing to supplement their present faith and leave them under the banner of Hinduism or Islam? How to relate ourselves to them and

their systems becomes at once an intricate matter. Do we still want to replace these systems by Christianity, or do we merely wish them to imbibe the spirit of Jesus Christ? Shall we completely fellowship the devotees of other systems? Shall baptism be suspended and even membership in a Christian body be regarded as non-essential? A host of questions will arise, and it will take a great deal of comparative study and a great deal of interchange of experience to discover the facts involved and determine the course missionaries are to take.

It cannot be doubted that the lay people of our Western churches are vitally disturbed by such admissions. Their first reaction is that if those systems have so much truth, why become excited about preaching Christianity to them? At once they sink into indifference regarding the missionary enterprise. There is no one issue on which we more certainly need a definite and simple statement than on this one. Until this situation can be stated satisfactorily for the common people of the churches, there will be increased coldness as regards missionary work.

Conclusion

There is no space here for a complete discussion of this problem. It is introduced in order to show that the Western world has reversed itself in general as to the values of Oriental faiths. This changed attitude has already had a disconcerting effect on the churches. Perhaps there is no reason to be disturbed. However, this statement alone will not relieve the tension or convince our church people that they should go on supporting missions. A far more definite statement of the situation is called for.

This introduction may now be brought to a close by

a few references to the mistakes of the home churches during the years we have brought under review.

As we look back over the last twenty years of missionary endeavour in the churches, we can discern some of the mistakes made. First of all, it is now evident that we have had no consistent effort to educate the Church as to missionary principles and practice. Only within a limited circle of women has missionary education had a place in the program of our churches. We have had a vast amount of publicity, and this temporarily helped the cause. But unfortunately no abiding conviction as to missions was created. We took the short cut to success. We followed the line of least resistance. To teach labouriously and to train the Church to think in missions, and to discipline the Church in missionary giving was too slow a program. Now we see how futile mere propaganda was and how utterly necessary it is really to educate the Church to world-mindedness.

Another point that becomes clearer each year is that missionary appeals have been closely associated with national interests. The movement, as will be seen, has been connected with the growing national spirit of all Western nations. How far our foreign missionary impulse comes from our nationalistic spirit is an issue brought forward in this volume. However, it would take a volume to deal with this one aspect of the missionary movement alone. In any case, we can now see clearly that when we were told that missions were necessary to the safety of the United States and to Western civilization, we were far off the track. Patriotism can never be the real motive of missionary effort. Not even a world-patriotism can suffice.

Another mistake has been the separation of Home

and Foreign Missions in making our appeal to the churches. It is absolutely necessary to see that the evangelistic impulse and the missionary impulse are one and the same thing. In each case there is the inward urge to help someone know Jesus Christ. The matter of distance or geography does not count. Whether we work and pray for a man across the street or across the ocean is not vital. Many persons of pronounced evangelistic fervour take no interest in what they call foreign missions. Our primary duty is to evangelize. No limits were set to the task. Our commission is to go into all the world. No man or woman is outside our interest, no matter how far away they may be. There is actually no difference in the impulse to evangelization of our own people from the impulse to evangelize natives of Africa or China. We cannot, therefore, separate Home and Foreign Missions, and the sooner we recognize this in our organization of the Church, the better it will be for all concerned.

I

THE VALIDITY OF THE MISSIONARY IDEA IN RELIGION

1. The Missionary Idea in Other Than the Religious Sphere

CHRISTIANITY is definitely and irrevocably a missionary religion. The most cursory survey of its literary background will entirely convince one of the truth of this assertion. Nothing is more characteristic of Christianity at its best than its missionary passion. Professor William Newton Clark has stated this fact in convincing fashion when he says: "The religion of Jesus Christ is a missionary religion. The work and example of its founder destined it to be such, its early spirit was missionary, and its history is a missionary history. Whenever it has lost its missionary quality, it has lost its character and ceased to be itself. Its characteristic temper has always been missionary, its revivals of life and power have been attended with quickening of missionary energy, and missionary activity is one of the truest signs of loyalty to its character and Lord." With this conclusion we must all agree. Christianity is fundamentally a missionary religion. For weal or for woe, it is that, and nothing can change the fact. In nothing is its true character more certainly revealed than in its missionary passion. This passion is at its heart, and to eliminate this would be to destroy the system.

It is at this point that many find fault with Christianity today. Many contend that neither Christianity nor any other religious system has a right to engage in making converts from another system. This conclusion must appear hasty and without validity when examined. No one can deny to any man, or race of men, the right to change their religious ideas for any they conceive to be better. No one can deny the privilege of promoting those ideas in religion, which seem to us worthy. Furthermore, no one can deny that whole nations or races have changed their religions in times past. As we must note in a moment, several of the great religious systems have proselytized, and have held the right to carry on missionary work. Whatever fault may be found here is attached to other faiths than Christianity.

First, we may note that men do not object to the missionary idea in other spheres. It is only in religion that the objection is raised. In politics, commerce, and education we accept the idea. No one objects to the exchange of political, social, or educational ideas. The missionaries of certain political schools travel all over the world, making converts to their theories wherever opportunity affords. The Communists of Russia have taken the world for their parish, and propose to plant their particular political and economic ideas in all lands. In theory this ambition cannot be condemned. The methods they employ may be condemned, but the right of proselytizing can hardly be denied. We are here not concerned with the truth of their ideas, but the right to propagate them as long as fair methods are used. Many political and economic schools vie with each other today in this political missionary movement. Through books and pamphlets, through lec-

ture tours and visits to foreign countries the work is carried on. The political missionary is very present in most parts of the world, including our own. Moreover, we must agree that much good will eventually come out of this exchange of ideas. It should not be forgotten that already the political organization of old countries has been greatly altered through this form of missionary work. Institutions long honoured in these lands are doomed. Still one can hardly say that the changes should not be encouraged.

In the field of science and education a great missionary effort is being put forth. Education, like religion, knows no national boundaries. It will not be confined to one race or nation. Science is thoroughly international in its activities, its findings, and its propaganda. Science can never be nationalized. No one thinks of hindering the international and universal propaganda of scientific ideas. Yet each of the great oriental peoples has its own ancient science which is now being rapidly replaced by modern Western science. Conceptions of the world long held in these lands are now giving way before the onward march of modern science. No one has the temerity to interpose any real objection to this form of missionary work. Again, the missionary idea is accepted by business people the world over. Merchants of Europe and America believe they have a right to carry on trade. They do not hesitate to introduce new wares, nor to replace wares long in use among the people. The missionary idea applied to commerce seems to be perfectly defensible. Yet many of the objections to religious missionary work in the Orient today are voiced by Western merchants. No one doubts that the Western merchant carries much to the East beside his wares. He is propagating many

ideas other than those relating to business. Perhaps no one would want to shut the Orient off from the Occident. The commercial exchanges are good for both hemispheres. To be sure new ideas and methods of trade will develop, but that will be good for trade in the long run. Nor do we change our mind about the desirability of trade exchanges, when we are assured that age-old customs in trade are being destroyed.

It is apparent that the propagation of religious teachings cannot logically be prevented while other forms of missionary work go on. If there is justification for introducing ideas in medicine, sanitation, commerce, politics, and education, there is surely no good ground on which to hinder the propagation of religious ideas. It is beside the point to say that the former do not arouse opposition while the latter does. It is very apparent that the conflict in the Orient today has been precipitated quite as much by these ideas as by the introduction of religious ideas. The results of one of these is as much in dispute as the other.

The fundamental idea back of all missionary endeavour in religion, science, education, and government is that truth is a thing to be shared. Because we hold this, we dare not stop the emissary of Russia, or the Labour Party in England, nor the scientific expert from Germany, nor the educational expert from America. Their work is desirable, and will help lift human life in all lands. Now it is certainly unreasonable to argue that religious teachers shall not enjoy the same freedom. Religion is not something so different or peculiar that freedom is not to be granted it. If any group of religious teachers have a body of truth, they are convinced will be valuable to mankind, is it not their duty also to promulgate those ideas in all lands?

We must conclude that there is no apriori reason why proselytism shall not be permissible in religion as in every other realm of human activity and interest.

2. The "Open Door" Policy in Religion

Much has been written about the "Open Door" policy in the Far East, and this discussion has principally had to do with commerce. However, some treaties between Western powers and Eastern peoples have included religion in the "Open Door" policy. That this is proper can hardly be questioned. There can be no justice in the policy which would secure the "Open Door" for commerce and not for education and religion. The contention of some that the Eastern lands must be kept open for commerce, but not for missionary activity can scarcely be defended. The "Open Door" doctrine, of course, has meant not merely that the East would be open to trade with the West, but that the nations should all be on an equal basis and enjoy equal opportunity for trade in these lands, and that no monopoly was to be secured by any one nation. This feature of the "Open Door" policy must be maintained in respect to culture and religion as well. Catholics or Buddhists must not prevent activity on the part of Mohammedans or Protestants. There must be equality of opportunity for all who desire to enter, so long as their methods are of a proper kind. Not even the Bolshevist can be prevented from carrying on his propaganda as long as he keeps within reason. The doctrine of the "Open Door" must apply to Western nations as well as Eastern nations. Oriental peoples should not be excluded or prevented from introducing their education and religion in the West, if they desire to do so. Professor N. D. Harris has stated the case

correctly. After speaking of the importance of an exchange of ideas, principles, and methods between West and East, he says: "This means that there must be an 'Open Door,' both in the West and in the East, to all the best products of modern religious and social ideals, inventive and creative genius, whether emanating from the Orient or from the Occident. It is imperative that the national and international life and development of the future should be intellectual and spiritual, as well as scientific and material" (*Europe and the East*).

It is apparent that religious propaganda cannot be stopped, while all other sorts of exchanges go on. Religious schools as conducted in the Orient have had many practical aspects. While operated for the teaching of religion, they teach many practical trades and vocations. They have assisted in agriculture, horticulture, architecture, and in many of the trades. These practical phases of missionary schools have been appreciated, and few Orientals would deny their value, but some think these same schools should not be permitted to teach religion. They seem to think that religion is in another category entirely. It is not intended here to discuss the much-debated question of compulsory religious teaching in the schools, but the right to teach religion to such as desire that service. The policy of excluding the teaching of religion will, of course, be the means of closing most missionary schools and colleges. This policy carried out in the United States would result in the closing of many colleges, since Christian people generally believe that education is incomplete without the inclusion of religion. Some years ago the Japanese Government inaugurated a policy of stopping the teaching of religion in missionary schools, but receded from that policy before many

years passed. The Government of Turkey is now essaying to stop all teaching of Christianity within the Turkish State. It is safe to say that it will recede from this position before many years pass. This policy is no doubt a sop to Islam against which so much deleterious legislation has been enacted. But logical consistency will compel the Angora Government to permit freedom of religion and therefore the teaching of religion, so long as proper methods are followed. Such a step always includes the possibility of making converts from one system to another, or what we have called the right of proselytism. From whatever angle this issue is approached, it is apparent that religious teachers must be accorded the same freedom as is given to educators, scientists, political economists, and traders.

3. The Missionary and Non-Missionary Religions

Christianity is not the only missionary religion. No classification proposed or adopted goes deeper than that of missionary and non-missionary religions. This division of religions was first proposed by Professor Max Müller in his celebrated missionary lecture delivered in Westminster in the year 1873. He pointed out that only a few systems could be said to be international and universal in aim; that only a few were really missionary. He also affirmed that only the missionary religions will survive. Many non-missionary systems have passed away, and he is no doubt correct when he affirms that only missionary religions will ultimately survive.

It has been often affirmed that we have but three truly missionary religions, namely, Buddhism, Christianity, and Mohammedanism. This statement may

not be quite accurate, yet in the main it is correct. It must be of great moment to Christians that at least two other systems have been and now are missionary in aim and purpose. This fact needs to be borne in mind in any discussion of this kind.

Most Christians would be amazed to learn that Buddhism conceived the missionary idea, and put it into practice five hundred years before the Christian era. It is an interesting historical parallel that the missionary idea was conceived at about the same time among the great Hebrew prophets and by Buddhists. The story of the missionary activities of the Buddhists before the Christian era is calculated to excite wonder by their scope and by the zeal exhibited. They literally planned to capture the world for Buddhism. The master mind of this vast expansion of Buddhism was Asoka—India's greatest ruler and builder. He not only gave endorsement to the movement, but placed the resources of his vast empire at the disposal of the movement. Buddhist missionaries traversed all Asia and visited Egypt and Europe. The canon of the Buddhist Scriptures was fixed by 263 B. C., and these scriptures were carried across the world. This church deliberately planned to make the world Buddhist. There is no general missionary zeal among those Buddhists today, yet there are signs of the old missionary passion coming to life again. In Japan there is a very strong missionary sentiment among certain Buddhists. A vast deal of labour is being expended on the Buddhist Gospel to make it acceptable to Western minds. They firmly believe that this Gospel is to be a universal Gospel.

The story of missionary zeal among Mohammedans is better known. From the first, Islam has been domi-

nantly missionary. Its passion for converts is its most arresting feature. It regards proselytism as a legitimate pursuit. From the first, it was possessed of this mighty passion for universal conquest in the name of the prophet. Nor are we just in asserting that this passion was expressed only through the sword. It has used the ordinary method of exposition and persuasion as other religions have done. Because of its missionary passion Islam will continue to play a large part in the religious life of mankind. It now numbers its devotees by millions. (Not less than 225 millions.) It is sure to increase numerically, for its followers do not hesitate to make converts wherever they go. It is foolish to accept the idea that Islam is a religion of the primitives, or of the heat belt only. It has ability to make converts from among all classes and races. It is true that it now makes most rapid headway in Africa among primitive tribes. But it must not be forgotten that it holds the majority of Near Eastern peoples, and that it also grows rapidly in India, Straits Settlements, and China. No discussion of Christian missionary activity is complete without these references to the missionary activities of other systems, and it is now apparent that the argument levelled against proselytism by Christians is to be applied also to Buddhists and Mohammedans. Those who demand that Christians cease their missionary activities must face the possibility of a world dominated by Islam. Neither Buddhism nor Islam are spent forces by any means. They must be reckoned with. From this standpoint the attack on Christian missions is not justified.

4. The Bearing of Missions on Vital Religion

Now we may come to closer grips with the idea of

proselytism, which is so offensive to many Orientals today. The word has a nasty connotation as used in these days. Perhaps we must more carefully define what we mean by proselytism. The dictionary defines the verb "proselyte" as the act of "converting to some religion, opinion, system, or the like. The making of converts in religion, philosophy, politics, or the like." If this is what is meant by proselytism, one can hardly be opposed to it. Moreover, if proselytism is wrong in religion, it must be wrong in other spheres, as we have shown, and the result must be stagnation in all these spheres of human knowledge and belief. The question we must face is, Do we favour the present status in all lands and among all races? Have the more advanced nations nothing to share with primitives? Have the great religious systems nothing to share with the animistic systems? Does not common honesty demand that the advanced peoples share their culture with the uncultured? And is not this the heart of missions, whether in the field of religion or commerce?

It may be said that sharing ideas with another people is not really missionary work and does not involve proselytism. Possibly the best that any one race has achieved can be passed over to other races without breaking down their institutions and religions. While this may be possible to a certain extent, yet in the introduction of new ideas, as such, there is the possibility of revolution and the overturn of society and religion as previously organized and practiced. Many people will be alienated from old associations and practices, and this chance must be taken if there is any real exchange of ideas and practices. When Buddhist missionaries come to California, they separate some people

from old associations. When Vedantist preachers work in Boston, they eventually establish a new church. When Western political ideas of democracy and nationalization penetrate into China, there is a revolution. In the end, old doctrines and forms of government will perish. So it ever must be unless we can shut our doors against new ideas and types of government. Now it is reasonable to believe that similar or commensurate changes will follow in the religious life of these peoples. But because changes threaten, shall religious missionaries be shut out? If religious teachers penetrate Asia, they will make converts, and nothing can hinder people from changing their minds in religion as in politics or education. In the final analysis, we must concede liberty to teach and preach to all, so long as proper methods are employed. Even the right of making converts must be conceded. For the most part, the leaders of religious life in the East, as well as in the West, concede this point. Mr. Mahatma Ghandi freely concedes the theoretical right of proselytism. He believes that the right to change one's religious ideas is an inherent right, and that such changes are to be expected. In the April (1926) number of the *International Review of Missions,* Dr. W. Paton refers to a resolution passed by the All India Unity Conference of 1924, in which there is a statement touching proselytism. They declare unequivocally for the right of every individual to change his religion, and to endeavour to convert others to his own religion. This resolution was passed by both Hindus and Mohammedans. But, as Mr. Paton remarks, the members of the Conference will probably continue to warn Christians against making converts from the other religions of India.

A final analysis shows that the one fallacy back of all the hue and din about Christian missionaries making converts from other religions is the claim that all religions are alike, teach the same ideas, lead to the same practices, and develop the same type of character. Here is the crucial question involved in missionary propaganda. But can this claim be justified? The world is full of religious cults. No informed man will defend all of them as good enough, or the best for the people professing them. The above statement has no semblance of truth except when we limit the religious field to six or eight of the great systems. But half the world's population is not included in these systems. Half the world is strictly animistic in religion. These animists exist in large numbers among more enlightened religionists. In some sections nearly the whole population belong in this category. No one questions the desirability of raising the religious level of these millions. Every one would admit that to raise these millions to the level of the great systems is most desirable. This will involve a very real conversion. Moreover, no one would seriously object to missionary work among such people. The criticism comes when effort is made to change the thinking and practice of devotees of the higher systems.

By every dictate of truth and reason, we are compelled to believe that some religious systems are nobler than others. It certainly is due every man to possess the best in religious knowledge. It becomes the duty of any man who is convinced that he possesses valuable religious truth to try to share it with his neighbours. Some persons would convince you that it is wrong to try to convert your immediate neighbours. Here this whole question of proselytism takes on a mighty prac-

tical character. The outcry against proselytism will put out the fires of personal evangelism at home as well as among foreign peoples.

From a broad point of view, we must agree that the exchange of religious ideas and practices is desirable. Stagnation must result where there is no difference or competition in the religious field. Contacts with exotic systems of religion will generate new life. Progress will follow such contacts.

It may be safely assumed that competition between religious systems will result in more vitality for all. Only through such contacts and exchange of teaching can religious life be lifted to the highest level. All religionists will have a keener interest in religion as a whole, and this will be wholesome. So far as the religions of the Orient are concerned, the worst that could happen to them would be to be left alone. Left to themselves, they will probably sink back into larger indifference. The impact of the Christian movement throughout the Orient has awakened all religions, and has caused them to engage in many kinds of activity long neglected. They are now earnestly doing what they should long have been doing on their own initiative. Buddhists in Japan are now doing all kinds of social service work undertaken by Christian missionaries. Confucianists now recognize social responsibility and begin many tasks for the alleviation of human woe. Hindus are aroused, today, over certain evils long prevalent in their country. That the Christian missionary has set the example and pointed the way in such social service, there can be no doubt. On the whole, we are compelled to conclude that the interests of vital religion are enhanced by the Christian movement throughout the Orient.

If any one is still worried lest some cult of the Orient may be destroyed and Christianity take its place, it may be said that this is likely to occur, but if it does occur, no truth will be lost. Whatever of truth they possess will likely be preserved and built into the new system. Such values will not only be preserved, but fructified, enriched, and built into some nobler system of religion. In the field of religion, as elsewhere, the fittest will survive, and in surviving will gather all real values of that which is passing away. The whole history of religion illustrates this principle. For hundreds of years Hinduism has absorbed cults which developed in some adjacent territory. These cults were often lost in name, but whatever of value they possessed was preserved. This process of religious cults dying to live again in some nobler system is a common one. It may reasonably be expected that many existing religious cults will die to live again in one of the nobler systems. It is certain that this is what happened to the cults of the Roman Empire as Christianity spread. Many cults passed away and yet their values were built into the Christian system and were preserved.

5. Bearing of Missions on International Relations

It may still be asserted that active missionary work is sure to be a hindrance to good international relationships; that it will be a source of friction and make for misunderstandings. Historically there are isolated instances where the presence of missionaries has been a source of friction, but generally speaking, Christian missions have assisted international good will. It is only by isolated cases that it can be shown that their influence has been hurtful. When the longer view is

taken and all the facts are considered, the missionary enterprise has been making for better understanding among the nations. Here the names of many missionaries, their work and influence in the interest of justice and good will rush to mind. Books could be filled with such instances. Leaving such illustrations aside, one may be satisfied to call attention to one large fact bearing upon the issue. If the world is to be unified, and if the spirit of rabid nationalism is to be tempered, it is essential that religions become international. The biggest factor in such extreme forms of nationalism is a national, racial, and local religion. Religion is not the only factor making for nationalism, but it is usually a most vital factor. The greatest danger grows out of a religion that is purely local and national. The Shinto cult in Japan illustrates the danger. The use of this ancient religion of Japan in creating an exaggerated sense of nationalism constitutes a peril of vast moment for Japan and the world. The glory of Buddhism and Islam, as well as Christianity, is their international interest and aspiration. A true internationalism awaits the day of international religions. Genuine world religions (with vast variety in one body) will be a tremendous asset to true internationalism and the establishment of proper international relations. It can hardly be doubted that the Christian Missionary Movement has increased international understanding, by creating world-wide interests and world-wide outlook. It certainly cannot be shown that the Christian movement has hindered international good will.

Conclusion

It is now reasonably evident that the missionary idea in religion can be defended against all critics. Our

investigation shows that non-missionary religions cannot finally survive. The truly missionary systems will replace the purely national or racial systems. It is, also, apparent that religions tend to stagnate and become fossilized when competition is removed. A vital religious life among the nations will be fostered by a free interchange of religious ideas. Ill advised methods of missionary work are not defended, but any fair methods of propaganda are surely to be desired. Efforts directed mainly to building up of a particular denomination or cult is not wise. Proselytism is generally believed to involve unfair policies of propaganda. If proselytism is intended to mean merely westernizing people, or causing them to accept a hard and fast system of theology, or tieing them up to some particular church, then it may properly be condemned. But when it means a sincere effort to teach men the truth of Christ, to help men imbibe His spirit, and to live His life, then we must defend such proselytism. If proselytism means a change in a man's spirit and character, bringing it into harmony with Christ, then it is certainly worth while. This is, of course, the sense in which the term should be used.

The Christian has his own deep and strong conviction about the value of Jesus Christ to other men. Those of us who have an experience of His saving power in our lives may be forgiven if we feel that all men will be made better by such an experience. To us He is the fairest among ten thousand and the one without whom no man can enter into the noblest spiritual experience. With Bernhard Lucas we believe: " Christianity is not one religion among many, the true as opposed to the false, but it is the consummation of the religious life itself, the fulfilment of every religious

aspiration which has ever stirred the hearts of men." With such a conviction as that filling our hearts, we will have no scruples about pressing it upon the attention of men in every land as opportunity affords.

II

MISSIONARY MOTIVES

1. Introduction

THERE is on every side a demand that our motives and aims in missions shall be restated. However satisfactory the arguments of yesterday were, they will not do today. At the present moment there is no little misgiving about the whole enterprise, and many are wondering whether, in view of the new attitude toward other religions, and the rapidly changing spirit of the non-Christian peoples, missions can be successfully defended. We are proposing, therefore, a thorough examination into the motives, as well as the objects and aims of missions, yesterday and today. In this chapter we will confine attention to motives as strictly as possible.

The Task Defined. The Church has recognized a missionary duty in every age. In some periods huge exertions have been put forth. In our own age we have made stupendous efforts to carry the Gospel to the non-Christian peoples. For a brief period, the churches of the West kept an army of nearly thirty thousand persons on the fields at an expense of more than seventy millions of dollars. Much of the work is done under difficult conditions and at great sacrifice. The churches at home have been besieged for ever-increasing contributions. Many church members have dedicated their lives to this kind of work. We may

ask, then, why this huge effort, and why do we carry on such a large piece of propaganda? Why are we willing to contribute millions to Christianize the world?

The Explanation of Its Enemies. One explanation is that Western peoples have a "will to power" and are possessed by the imperialistic ambition; they seek the economic exploitation of all nations. They regard religion as one of the aids to this world-wide exploitation. Foreign missions have been and are a part of the program of the conquering races. The missionary enterprise today must be interpreted as part of the program of Western nations to dominate and control weaker peoples. So think some of our critics.

This view is too sweeping and may be passed with slight attention. It may, however, be made the occasion of examining more closely our real motives and aims. It is possible that the "will to power" among Nordics has made missions a favourite occupation. It may turn out that racial and national sentiments have had a larger place in the movement than we have supposed.

Over against this view we may place the contention of the churches. They profess to be moved by spiritual motives. They profess to seek only the religious welfare of the non-Christian peoples, and will have no part in the economic or political exploitation. It is, therefore, important to discover the motivation of the movement and to cast out the economic or political spirit if we find it present. It is incumbent upon us to state more clearly what our motives and aims are to be for the future.

A Powerful Motive Needed. It will be evident that an enterprise so vast requires a powerful and abiding motivation. No secondary motives will keep such a

movement going. Dr. McKenzie is right when he says: " It is only when these deep inner reasons for the absolute and universal character of the Christian religion have been deeply and inwardly grasped that missionary fervour will break out into a great flame of generous, intelligent, yet passionate and sacrificial service." There are imperative reasons why we must discover the deeper and surer foundations of the movement. While we discover the fact of universality in Christianity, we must discover also the universal and essential missionary urge.

Dr. W. N. Clark voices the same opinion in his chapter on the " Missionary Motive " (*Study of Christian Missions*). He says: " The Christian people who have the work of missions to perform, must of course be influenced by some motive, or motives, impelling them to it. It is a great work, and the motives must be deep, strong, self-justifying, and permanent, if the work is to be done with vigour and persistency. If Christianity is really a missionary religion, it must provide some such motive or group of motives." The history of missions shows that Christianity has provided the incentives, which sent men over oceans to uncivilized races into lands where health was impossible for white men, and where they endured every privation. There has certainly been some profound inward conviction that men dare not betray. This deep inward incentive has been present again and again.

Various Missionary Motives. As we go in search of such a motive, we will find that men have been strangely moved by ideas impossible to us. But these ideas, now vacated for us, created a veritable fire in their bones. They went, not counting the cost. " Human motives are always complex, whether they be high

or low. This is the case not merely because men are urged in rival directions by contending forces, but also because, when they are impelled in one direction, it is usually by the resultant of many varying forces. It is, therefore, with 'motives' in the plural rather than 'motive' in the singular, that we are to deal in attempting to describe, in any era, the power that lies behind and stimulates effort to extend the Kingdom of God; and we shall find them to be various and not altogether harmonious" (*The Missionary Motive,* W. Paton, p. 90).

"Right down the ages two factors have determined the progress of the Kingdom of God, and made possible every missionary awakening; (1) *the call of the world,* the turning of the heart of man towards his fellow-man, dependent on his increased knowledge of the world and its inhabitants; (2) *the call of God,* the turning of the heart of man towards God, dependent on his increased knowledge of his own need and the greatness of God's salvation."

"(1) No great missionary movement appears independent of the stimulus of geographical discovery, political extension on the part of Christian nations, or political development on the part of non-Christian nations. As Livingstone said: 'The end of the geographical feat is the beginning of the missionary enterprise.'

"(2) No great missionary movement ever appears apart from a spiritual awakening, a turning of the soul to God individually or corporately. As St. John said: 'We love, because he first loved us.'"

These quotations strike off the fundamental facts of missionary history. The history itself and the interplay of these forces is not so simple as might be in-

ferred. Truly human motivation is a complex problem. When we look into the souls of missionaries and ask what motive is uppermost, we shall have a diversity of replies. But we shall find, on the whole, these two factors (manward and Godward) present in each chapter of missionary history. We believe, however, that the inward, God-created factor is after all the essential factor. Our study will revolve around "the impulsion from within and the attraction from without," or, in other words, the call of God and the call of the world.

Before undertaking the discussion of motives in modern missions, it will be well for us to make a brief survey of missionary motives in history. We shall rapidly survey the various epochs and inquire what motives were most potent.

2. Historical Survey

1. *The Missionary Motive in St. Paul.* Inasmuch as St. Paul is the typical missionary of all ages and played so tremendous a part in the founding of the Church, we may first of all try to discover the essential motive of his career. At the outset we must recognize that he had every human preparation for his missionary task. He had his Jewish ancestry and the training of a Rabbi, united with birth and rearing in a Greek city and Roman citizenship. His long contact with Gentiles before his conversion gave him an appreciation of them very exceptional among Jews. All of these factors made him able to evaluate Christianity as a universal religion. But all these things did not make him the Christian missionary he was. He might have remained a Jew and a missionary of Judaism. We must not forget that he was a Jew, busy with the task of proselytism. He was a born propagandist. He possessed

unfaltering zeal, burning conviction, and boundless energy. The one event which turned him about and made him a flaming Christian missionary was his conversion. Added to all the natural training for the vocation of missionary was added a powerful religious experience. In this conversion he experienced the love of God in Christ. This meant, in part, a new idea of God for him and formed the basis of his missionary convictions. When he had thus met Jesus on the Damascus road, he was filled with an undying passion to preach Him both to Jews and Gentiles. While various motives were doubtless present in his life, it is perfectly clear that the grand incentive with him was what he described as the love of Christ shed abroad in his heart and constraining him in all his labours. He felt himself to be debtor to Christ. Loyalty demanded that he herald the name of Jesus to all men. He must have understood Jeremiah's statement when he said: "If I say I will not make mention of him, nor speak any more in his name, then there is in my heart as a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I weary myself to hold it in, but cannot" (Jer. 20:9). Paul was actuated by a profound sense of loyalty to Christ. He was His slave. It was this sense of debtorship and loyalty that drove him on in hours of deepest discouragement.

It seems certain that we have come upon the one essential and abiding missionary motive in this first and greatest of those who have gone forth to the missionary task. It will be more in keeping with our plan to defer a more particular analysis and discussion of this motive. We may see how we thus have an example and illustration of the highest religious motive a man may possess.

2. *The Missionary Motive in the Early Church.*

The motive of the early Church was no doubt similar to that of St. Paul. The will of Christ was no doubt the primary fact for them. They no doubt believed that it was His wish that the good news be spread as quickly and as widely as possible. They were sure that He was God's Messiah-Saviour for the whole world, and He had left them only for a short time. Soon He would return in power and glory. In the interim there was much to do. No time was to be lost in the work of evangelism. It is pretty sure that the first generation of Christians, especially, was moved by eschatological ideas. This idea fades out slowly and after a few generations is no longer a cardinal source of inspiration. But this hope of an immediate return of the Lord did not prevent them from realizing His spiritual presence with them. First and last, this is the source of their enthusiasm and their abiding impetus to missions. Here was a group of persons who had passed through a most vital experience of sins forgiven, and the gift of peace filled their hearts. They told others out of gratitude and joy what the Lord had done for them. A great blessing had come to them in the acceptance of Christ, and they wanted all men to know that joy and that blessing. It is probable that very few of the early Christians had any carefully conceived ideas about missions. They do not seem to have made any use of the Great Commission passage, if they possessed it. They simply had an experience of Christ which was overmastering and in the glow of that experience they simply had to go forth and tell other men what He was to them. Here we get at the essential missionary or evangelistic impulse which spontaneously springs up in the hearts of men who enter into this deep inward experience of the love of God in Christ.

This love impels them out. They simply must tell the good news. This is the cardinal fact in the history of the early Church and the one fact which explains the amazing missionary activity of the first two hundred and fifty years of the Church's life.

It does not appear that either love of empire or love of the Church had a noticeable place in the minds and motivation of the early Christians. As the years passed, possibly the Church became an institution that drew out the admiration and affection of believers. St. Paul's latest epistles give a larger place to the Church than the earlier ones. By the end of the third century the Church was a powerful organization and began to figure in the impulse to evangelize. However, for the earlier part of the first three centuries the Church was not much in the consciousness of Christians, and they did not preach, inspired by love for the Church, but by love of Christ. The majority of the early Christians did not have Paul's love for the empire. How large his admiration of the empire was does not appear on the face of his letters. Scholars assert that there are many indications of a deep devotion to the things of the empire in which he had citizenship. But such patriotism as Paul possessed had little to do with his stupendous labour of love as a missionary. It is not possible that patriotism can go far toward explaining that eager enthusiasm he showed as a missionary.

3. *Missionary Motives in the Middle Ages.* In the second period of expansion and widespread missionary effort we must recognize a variety of motives. The conversion of northern Europe is a stupendously important fact for history. It took several centuries of time and prodigious display of energy to compass the end. Some sections of the country never willingly sur-

rendered to the missionaries. Only after murderous attacks by the sword did they nominally embrace Christianity. No doubt the sad admixture of motives in the promoters of missions created the difficulty. Political aims and ends were served in the missions. This fact the tribal leaders of northern Europe understood only too well. Had the missionaries been the agents of religion alone when they approached these untamed peoples of the north, their evangelization might have been fairly easy. The evangelizing Church was too often the ambassador of the empire. The missionary was the forerunner of Roman civilization. He was to add another province to the Empire-Church.

The imperial motive is undoubtedly prominent. It is this imperialistic motive that works in the mind of Pope Gregory as he sees the fair-haired and the blue-eyed Saxons. Is it not a pity to think that these should be lost? But there is also the thought that a new province can be added to the Empire of the West. The people of the British Isles must be brought in to save them from eternal destruction, but that is secondary to the vision he has of a new province. It may be bad for heathen to be damned, but it is still worse not to take the opportunity to make another Roman province for the Church. But one cannot say that all missionaries were agents of imperialism. Among them were many deeply religious men, who cared little for the glory of the empire, but who went out through love and devotion to Christ. Yet to extend the empire was a passion with many. To evangelize was to spread civilization with all its beneficent influences.

The ecclesiastical motive reached a high point in this period. The Church had absorbed the organization of ancient Rome and was both a spiritual and temporal

ruler. Great political power was wielded by the Church. She was also a great spiritual empire. Missionaries went out through devotion to the Church. Their passion was to add souls to the Church.

In this period missionary work was often promoted by temporal rulers. These rulers were members of the Holy Roman Empire. The worst evils that ever grew out of missionary effort were due to the control exercised over it by the temporal rulers. They had orders to convert their peoples, forcibly if necessary, and to secure their baptism. The use of force as an agency in converting men to Christ is a pathetic chapter of Church history. When one remembers how some of the northern European peoples were won to Christianity, he does not wonder that it has never meant more to them.

Over against this sad picture of missions in the Middle Ages, we must place some alleviating facts. Among the thousands of monks who shared in this work there were many who entirely rejected such methods and were motivated by spiritual ideals and sought spiritual ends in their converts. Many of them were spiritual according to their light. They were not concerned about the empire. A majority of the missionaries who converted northern Europe were from Ireland, Scotland, and England. The churches in these lands for a long time were more or less independent of Rome and were somewhat Protestant in character. The monks of Iona and Lindesfarne were not impregnated with ideas of civilization and empire as were those that came from southern Europe, where the Church was already dominant in the empire. If it is true that the missionary sent by Rome was moved by imperialistic designs, it must be as frankly said that the Celt was actuated by

spiritual designs. He stands for the interior impulsion. Many of them went out for love of Christ and human souls. The latter idea is seen to have added importance when we remember that it was in this period that the doctrine of eternal punishment of sinners received full elaboration. The ideas of heaven and hell were most potent. The heathen were to be snatched from the eternal burning. They carried a tremendous burden on their consciences as they preached, for sinners were doomed to an eternal hell. For several hundred years this was to be a prominent motive in missions. (See further below in this chapter.)

It is now clear that in this period the spiritual motive was in the background and not so dominant as it had been in the early Church. There is a strange mixture of reasons for missions. Love of empire and love of the Church were foremost, no doubt. But these motives were softened somewhat by the fact that a minority of missionaries went to their task out of love for Christ, and the desire to save souls. In addition, there was the call that came in view of the conditions of life in this period. Discovery and exploration were adding much new knowledge of these peoples. In part, missionary enthusiasm is to be explained by this fact. What is strangest of all to us is that until the tenth century there was little thought of people beyond the bounds of Europe.

4. *The Missionary Motive in the Later Catholic Missions.* When the world was opened to European traders through the perfecting of the mariner's compass, in the fifteenth century, a new epoch in missions was begun. The lands of the East with their vast populations were then accessible. It is true that a few intrepid missionaries found their way into Central Asia

and the Far East during the Middle Ages. Yet the difficulties of travel over the wild and arid lands of Central Asia were such that a very few would ever reach the East. With the advent of sailing ships, in the sixteenth century, it became possible for many missionaries to reach these lands. Then the newly discovered Americas were opened and a new field of missions was thus found. As this age of discovery and exploration advanced, it is apparent that Catholics utilized it to the full. Every exploring ship carried missionary priests. Wherever trade stations were fixed, there the priests opened work, depending upon their nationals for support and safety. It happened that the earliest expansion of commerce from Europe was in the Catholic countries, Spain, Portugal, and France. It was for this reason especially that Catholicism got a big lead on Protestantism, which had just been born. But the English and the Dutch were soon to get into the field and were destined to larger success in colonization than the Catholic powers (unless France be excepted).

It would be impossible to exaggerate the importance of the commercial expansion of Europe in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries for Christian missions, both Catholic and Protestant. The supreme motives of the commercial expansion were commercial, patriotic, and religious. The national spirit was beginning to show itself in the European nations. It must not be overlooked that the modern missionary movement is synchronous with the rise of nationalistic aspirations in Europe and is one phase of a mighty expansion of Europe which has very literally changed the map of the whole world. In addition to the desire for the extension of trade and territory by European nations, there was the desire to spread the

Christian religion. Thus the missionary became a vital part of the expansion movement. He depended to a considerable degree upon the movement of commerce and naturally shared the success or failure of trade. As the records show, the Catholic missionary was not reluctant to assist his nationals in gaining their ends and at the same time placing his nation under deep obligation to him, and he generally used his nationals to further the work of missions. Francis Xavier did not hesitate to ask his nationals in India to use the force of government to compel the Indian official class to submit to baptism. The same story was enacted in Japan and in other lands.

From these statements it will appear that various missionary motives are found in the period of Catholic missions. We have the old imperialistic motive taking a new form and is better described as nationalistic, especially in the latter part of the period. It is clear that the Catholic missionaries of these centuries were actuated by love of the Church, love of their native lands, and in some measure by purely spiritual impulses. Human need is always a conditioning factor. We have no way of striking a balance between these various motives. Sometimes one is stronger and sometimes the other. But *devotion to the Church* and *devotion to country* were pretty constant factors. While admitting the presence of spiritual incentives, we cannot affirm that this incentive was controlling. The old doctrine of heaven and hell still worked its miracles within the body of the Church so far as furnishing support of the movement was concerned. There were vivid pictures of the lost peoples of the earth. These pictures affected the popular mind deeply. This was the great point of appeal for support. But this was

probably not a controlling idea with all the clergy or with the higher officials of the Church. For a minority it was a love of souls for whom Christ died. This minority gave the movement the appearance of being spiritual. The great majority of priests were not primarily actuated by such a care of souls, but were moved by patriotic and churchly loyalties.

5. *Motives in Early Protestantism.* The two controlling factors in the background of early Protestant missions are (1) the reformation conflict which completely absorbed the Protestants for nearly two hundred years, (2) and the increasing part played by Protestant nations in the expansion of Europe. It is significant that early Protestants did not have the foreign missionary impulse. They were wrapped up in the conflict with the Catholic hierarchy, and this took all their energies for a long period. But the discouraging fact is that they did not have a strong missionary interest. Indeed, they found many reasons for not accepting the missionary obligation. The favourite argument being that the Gospel had already been preached to the whole world. This argument was accepted by Luther and a majority of Church leaders for a long period.

It was inevitable that the colonial interests of Protestant powers would sooner or later enlist the Protestant Church in their affairs, even as the Catholic powers had done. Protestants could not stand aloof permanently from the genuine missionary opportunity presented by the colonial developments in various parts of the world. The first Protestant missionaries going to the Far East went as chaplains to their own nationals. Their nationals located in the foreign parts began to feel a certain responsibility for the peoples they

traded with or ruled. From this angle it is clear that the earliest missionary interests were tied up with trade and political interests. This was especially true of the British. However, it is true in regard to the Swedes, the Dutch, and the Danes. The old idea that rulers were responsible for the moral and religious welfare of their subjects still had force. The first Protestant missionaries were sent out more or less under the direction of rulers. The first Protestant training centre for missionaries came into being in the same way.

However, there is another aspect of the situation. Within the Protestant bodies there arose groups known as "pietists." These groups had much to do with the development of a missionary consciousness within the Protestant churches. They rejected the time-worn arguments against missions. They accepted the duty of proclaiming Christ to the whole world and believed this to be a primary duty of the Church. These groups were not much concerned with colonial developments. They were not moved by nationalistic incentives, nor yet by loyalty to the Church as an institution. They believed themsleves absolutely removed from all such considerations. Indeed, there is a revival within these groups of the original New Testament motives in missions. They were spiritually minded believers of a zealous and emotional sort. They had a religious experience which brought great joy and peace. They surely were bound to tell others of their experience. No more zealous or devoted missionaries ever went out. The Wesleyan Revival in England took its rise from these pietists and in turn greatly contributed to the missionary consciousness of the churches.

The situation, then, in early Protestantism may be summarized as follows: Primarily, mission work was

begun through alliance with commercial enterprises in the non-Christian nations. The facilities for travel and residence in foreign parts were available. The world was open. The need in the foreign lands began to be known. To some extent nationalistic aspirations gave encouragement to missions. More and more the old imperialistic motive was supplanted by the patriotic. Thus, we see how favourable was the external factor. Secondly, we see also how a new spiritual life was touching Protestants through the pietistic groups on the continent. Here was a return toward the condition within the early Christian Church. The revival in England under the Wesleys and more sporadic revivals without were to furnish the deeper spiritual incentives from which modern Protestant missions were to develop.

It is clear that down to the end of the eighteenth century there was an uncertain missionary note within Protestantism. Later we see a variety of motives. Some of the old doctrines are still potent. The striking factors are (1) the spirit of nationalism just beginning to be potent, and (2) a return to the more spiritual motives, at least by small groups within the churches.

This historical sketch of missionary motives prepares us for an analysis of more modern motives. We propose now to touch briefly upon a cluster of motives, more or less incidental in character and transient in their effect on the Church. Then we shall attempt a constructive statement of fundamental missionary motives today.

3. Some Motives Not Generally Operative

We may now consider a cluster of motives that must be regarded as largely vacated today, but which have

played a big part in missionary work in some epochs in the past.

1. *The Return of Christ to Reign on the Earth.* There have been many believers in modern times whose primary motive for missionary effort has been the return of Christ. They believe that a preaching of the Gospel is necessary before He can return. The little flock must be gathered out of all nations. Their primary interest is not the conversion of the heathen in large numbers, but to create the condition of Christ's return. Some of these people would feel much as Jonah did toward the Ninevites, if there should be a general conversion of the people in any of these lands. Now this is a very real factor with this small group, but cannot be classified as a primary or essential motive. However sincere they may be, there is likely to be a disillusionment sooner or later. The historian merely recognizes that here we have one of the incentives to missionary activity.

2. *Pity for the Doomed Heathen.* Many earlier Protestant missionaries held to the idea that the non-Christian people were doomed to eternal destruction, and this was the chiefest reason why men should believe in and work for missions. Missionaries drew pictures of the millions of the heathen world dropping into hell for want of the knowledge which the Church could impart to them. The idea of eternal punishment for all unbelievers was current in most Protestant circles at that time. It was natural that this should also be true of missionaries. The missionary was a person privileged to snatch a few souls from the eternal burning. We have seen how this idea played quite a part in the mission work of the mediæval Church. It is said that Bishop Willibrod was once about to baptize

a heathen chieftain and was suddenly halted with the question: "Where are my dead forefathers now?" To which the Bishop replied in a harsh voice, "In hell with all other unbelievers." Whereupon the chieftain concluded not to receive baptism, but to go to hell with his forefathers. Henry Martyn, the burning apostle to India and to the Near East, is said to have suffered greatly because he had not done more to save the millions who were fast dropping into hell. An African convert is reported to have lived in daily terror lest he should die before baptism and be cast into hell forever.

While it is evident this idea played a considerable rôle for a time in missions, yet it cannot be shown that the great missionaries like Carey, Judson, Morrison, Duff, Livingstone, Mackay, or Thoburn were controlled by such an idea or moved chiefly by such a motive. It is evident that this was never a true or essential motive. It must be classified as a minor motive at most. It is not operative today except in very limited circles.

Many declared that the passing of this idea would cut the taproot of missions. Now we see that the greatest missionary epoch in history of the Church has been synchronous with the passing of this doctrine. Missions have not been hurt by the loss of this incentive. Some people who have little interest in missions and do nothing to help the cause profess to be very much interested in the question as to the future of those who die without a knowledge of Christ. This is a very academic interest. It is more important to discuss what is going to become of professing Christians who deny their Master's cause and refuse to do their duty toward others rather than what is to become of the multitudes who never had a chance to know Christ. Surely all such persons shall have their chance

somewhere. Moreover, this belief does not lessen our responsibility to preach the Gospel to the peoples now. As believers in a holy God, we certainly must hold that He is not going to condemn any to *eternal* darkness who have not even had a chance to know the truth.

3. *The Deluded Heathen.* In the early days of Protestant missions the idea was commonly held that the other religions of the world were entirely false, and that the job of the missionary was to destroy them root and branch. As already indicated, that idea has practically passed away. Today we believe that these systems have considerable truth in them, and that they live by the truth in them, not by the error. We do not feel called upon to convince them that their ancestral faith is entirely false. God has not left Himself without a witness anywhere. Whatever light men have is from Him, and we are glad to recognize that fact. We do believe that the highest of these religions are incomplete and insufficient to save men in the highest sense of the term. We believe that these systems have much to learn from Christianity, and as a matter of fact, they are rapidly learning it. Our missionary enterprise rests on the proposition that all religions may be vastly enriched through Jesus Christ, who is quite above and beyond all founders of religion, and that in His religion there is that which is unique and superior and which the rest of the world needs to know, yea, must know in order to reach their highest development and strength. We believe that Christianity is the crown of these systems and that they shall find completion in it. Of ancient Judaism Jesus said: "I am not come to destroy but to fulfil." This is what we believe He would say of the other religions today. He is not come to destroy them but to bring them to fruition.

The issue here raised about the higher religions of the world does not apply to half of the world of men, for nearly half the world is animist in religion, and there would be no question about their need of a nobler system. But even the highest systems do not satisfy the strivings of their devotees. Even as St. Paul found Judaism insufficient to bring him abiding peace, even though he was devoted to the uttermost, so we believe in the deep of many hearts that cling to Buddhism or Islam there is that same dissatisfaction and evident desire for a fulness they know not. Rev. E. Stanley Jones states that this was the fact brought to light in many "Round Table" discussions with various religionists in India. (See *The Christ of the Round Table.*) This will certainly be more true as education and intelligence make their way in the non-Christian world. There is sure to be an army of intelligent and informed men who are going to look beyond their ancestral faiths for satisfaction. In the final analysis we find ourselves agreeing with Peter and John when they declared that in no other name was salvation, if we mean salvation in the fullest and completest sense of the term.

The old idea of the heathen as a completely deluded man has gone, but we have not jumped to the other extreme that therefore there is no need of Christian missions. Rather do we rejoice in the mission of Christianity as the fuller and entirely satisfactory religion which even the highest faiths need to know.

4. Missionary Motives in Recent Times (Protestantism)

We have now sketched the various motives at work in Christian believers from the earliest days to our own

age. In each age or period we have been able to discern the factors which actuated the Church in missions. Over this long period of time it is not possible to speak of a motive, but always of motives. The only exception is in the early Church. There we saw the supreme motive at work, but the Church was not able to maintain that high level. She soon began to act upon other than spiritual motives and forces. The various motives we have discovered may be brought under four heads: (1) the Political, (2) the Churchly, (3) the Philanthropic, and (4) the Spiritual. Now we must inquire as to how far these motives are to be found in modern Protestant missions. What has actuated the churches in this world-wide enterprise? Have we discovered any new motives? How far have we been governed by the same considerations as the Church in other epochs?

It may be suggested that we are too close to our own movement to understand its motivation. It will only be after the lapse of time that its true inwardness may be discovered. However, we believe that main incentives of the modern movement may be discerned and in the end will be seen to be very similar to those of other ages.

1. *The Political Motive (Nationalism).* No movement of our day can be understood without a consideration of this vital factor of nationalism. Few advocates of missions realize how much this spirit of nationalism has to do with missions. We may repeat the statement made above that the modern missionary movement is synchronous with the rise of nationalistic states in Europe. It may be assumed that some kinship exists. When we look for our motivation in missions, we dare not fail to ask whether we have been moved by nationalistic ambitions. It is so easy and simple to declare

that our motive has been wholly spiritual. Any student of missionary history will find many evidences of the national spirit in modern missionaries. Political affiliations have been vital. Even our missionaries have generally failed to rise above national bias. There are some noble examples to the contrary, but they are the exceptions and not the rule. Perhaps this fact can best be illustrated by noting the methods and aims of missionaries, as well as the policies adopted by missionary boards. However, our methods and aims will have later consideration and cannot be treated here. This writer feels that a study of the movement as a whole will show that the nationalistic spirit has been among our rather vital motivations.

When one considers how often missionaries have had part in treaty-making with mission peoples, and how those treaties were generally to the injury of the peoples concerned, and to the commercial and territorial advantage of their own nations, he gets an idea of the working of the nationalistic spirit in missions. In more than one instance, missionaries have assisted their nationals in seizing and holding advantage. The Jesuits in Siam were most helpful to France in her annexation of Chinese territory in Tonkin and Annam, and earlier in getting a foothold in Siam. What Catholics have done is no more than Protestants have done. Christian Frederich Schwartz, though not a Britisher, was eminently helpful to England in her struggle to gain supremacy in South India. It is well known how influential were S. Wells, Williams and W. A. P. Martin in the treaty-making with China. How these missionaries salved their consciences is rather hard to understand. Peter Parker was the advocate of an aggressive policy against China and raised the American flag

over Formosa for a year, eventually finding Washington adamant against his proposed annexation. It is unnecessary to go into many details here. Plainly, missionaries have often joined with their nationals to achieve ends desired by their governments. There are illustrations to the contrary, and such a statement cannot include all.

In all such actions the missionaries were working in harmony with their boards and their national constituencies. How far such patriotic considerations have figured in arousing missionary interest at home would be a good subject for investigation. As missionaries in the Middle Ages were devotees of the empire and representatives of Roman civilization, as the Catholic priests of a later period went to their missionary task through love of Church and France, and worked for the greater glory of the Church and France, or Spain, or Portugal, so the Protestants of modern times have surely been actuated in a measure by patriotic sentiments. Many will refuse to make this admission, but facts warrant the deduction. Practically all groups of nationals, with the possible exception of the Moravians and other pietist bodies and small bodies like the Plymouth Brethren or Christian Alliance, have had a large admixture of the national spirit, and perhaps no exceptions need to be made in the cases mentioned.

It will here be recalled that one of the stock arguments for missions a few years ago was that our safety as white men and as white nations demanded that we carry the Gospel to the yellow peoples of the Orient. We were thinking in terms of our national aspirations. Indeed, it is certain that we have been selfish in no small measure, even in foreign missions.

2. *The Ecclesiastical Motive.* It is evident that the

idea of the Church plays an enormous part in Catholic missions. The Church is so exalted in all their teaching and training that it could not be otherwise. Men were schooled in attachment for the Church. It was to them an institution to live for and even to die for. An institution so emphasized in their minds could hardly help becoming a source of motivation. With us Protestants the Church can never quite occupy the place it does with Catholics. However, no one can study the work of missions today and not realize that to some extent the raising up of the Church in other lands has been a potent reason for missions. The writer does not here allude to the fact that the Church was intended to be a missionary institution. That fact has been made plain in our earlier study of the missionary idea in the early Church. What we do mean to assert here is that it is quite possible for the *Church and its extension in foreign lands to become an end in itself,* and often we have been motivated by the desire to see our Church widely extended in the world and the consequent power that will accrue through such extension. Several denominations have fallen into the idea that the extension of their churches (in their American forms) was an absolutely necessary accomplishment. The Church at best is a means to an end. We now begin to see that the establishment of our particular denomination is a questionable goal. Perhaps it may be better for the Kingdom in the earth that our Western denominationalism shall not be fastened upon the Orient. It is just conceivable that the Oriental peoples will want a very different church or even no church at all in our sense of the term. We may well believe that the raising up of an indigenous church is desirable, although that may mean the rejection of our denomination. So we must

conclude that the church motive cannot be essential in Protestant missions, as it is in Catholic missions. In that case, the Church is an end, not a means. So love for the Church and ambition to extend her sway may become an essential motive. For Protestants this can never be so.

3. *"The Philanthropic Motive" (The Need of the World).* The history of missions shows that running along with the spiritual, the patriotic, and the churchly motives is the consciousness of need among the non-Christian peoples. The philanthropic motive has been effective in many epochs. Something of this idea is seen in the Middle Ages. With the discovery of the new world and the fuller knowledge of the old, there burst in upon Europeans the fact that millions of human beings lived under inhuman conditions and that much of their misery could be relieved. As the science of medicine developed, the duty seemed still clearer. To no small degree modern missions have been simply a huge philanthropy. The obligation to use our wealth in relief of the suffering heathen has been apparent.

It is now evident that our representation of conditions in non-Christian lands has been unfortunate, in that the picture was one-sided and unfair. Too much has been said about the darker aspects of life in those lands, and not enough about the brighter side. It was not quite fair to place bits of the worst in Oriental life before our people and neglect the best. We now begin to talk much more about the achievements of these peoples, and that is well. However, there was much truth in the presentation. Conditions of life are very bad. It is no use trying to blink that fact. A fair presentation of the need is thoroughly justified.

(a) One does not need to travel far within most non-Christian countries to discover their dire need. This appalling need has made a deep impression upon all who had sympathy or humanitarian feelings. Mrs. W. F. McDowell has been reported as saying, after she had seen the woe and poverty in India, " How can we ever be happy again after all that we have seen in India? " Mrs. Bird Bishop, who is reported to have begun her travels with no missionary or religious interest, was so stirred by what she saw, especially of the sorrows and wrongs of childhood and womanhood, that she became one of the best advocates of missions of the past generation.

(b) The physical needs of the non-Christian world are appalling. We are impressed with this fact when we remember that half the world at the present time knows not the blessing of medicine, surgery, sanitation, or hospitals. Thousands die every year in these lands for want of the simplest treatment which modern medical science could provide. It is said that one in every ten persons in the Orient is sick, helpless and useless. Infant mortality is more than twice as great as in Western lands. Then there are too few safeguards against famine, pestilence, and disease. Only a knowledge of science can supply those safeguards. Millions die unnecessarily in these lands from famine and infectious diseases. The poverty of the East is proverbial, and it has not been overdrawn. We of the West have but small idea of the poverty so general and so dire. We are scarcely entitled to talk of our poverty in the West. The Western world has generally a surplus of foodstuffs. This was true of Europe before the war. Thousands of tons were sent to the bottom of the sea and Europe has now been short. But Europe will

catch up soon if wars cease. The East, however, has for centuries barely been able to support life. The margin is so small that only a limited famine results in loss of life. The trouble there has not been due only to a limited supply of foodstuffs, but to the lack of facilities for rapid transportation of it to needy districts. Wheat ships may lie in Shanghai harbour, but it is a long time before the wheat can reach the back-lying provinces. Their problem is one of slowing down the birth rate on the one hand and the speeding up production of food supplies and their rapid transportation throughout the country on the other. The conditions of physical life for many millions in China, India, and Africa are unbelievably low and bad. Millions live on rations that a white man could not long exist upon.

(c) The intellectual needs are just as appalling. The illiteracy of most of the non-Christian world is astonishingly high. Only a small percent of India's women can read or write. China is scarcely better off, though she boasts of a great love of learning and a noble culture. Her masses are densely illiterate. In Africa, outside of limited areas, the condition is even worse. Less than 5,000,000 children in China were in school in 1922, or only one in 80 of her population. She has at least 60,000,000 of children of school age. India has over 750,000 villages and only 142,203 village schools. There are not less than 60 children to a village, which would give India not less than 43,000,000 children of school age. Only a small percent have school privilege. Japan is in striking contrast. She has ninety-five to ninety-eight percent of her children in primary schools, and illiteracy will soon be unknown in that land. Japan is the only non-Christian country in which this is true. She has seen the meaning of education from the West-

ern lands and has made haste to give this blessing to all her people.

(d) There is need of new social ideals and reforms. Some terrible social barbarities are practiced in these non-Christian lands. At once we think of foot-binding and opium in China, or suttee, child marriage, and perpetual widowhood in India, or the cruel seclusion of women and girls in Mohammedan lands. The best minds of these lands are agreed that these conditions must be abated. But these peoples have huge problems in abating these ancient wrongs. The motive of reform has been tremendously quickened in these lands by the efforts of missionaries. The new social ideals in those lands is largely due to the missionary impact. The leaders of other faiths are awakened to see the vision of better social conditions and are working feverishly to bring them about.

The need of these lands, as we must see more clearly in a later paragraph, is not primarily physical or intellectual or social, but spiritual. The spiritual strivings of these peoples have been deflected and their aspirations have gone unsatisfied. We are there primarily to show them One who can fully meet their spiritual strivings and satisfy the longing of their hearts.

We must not fail to see that, however strong the philanthropic motive may be, it is only secondary and can never afford a lasting impulse to Christian missions. The time is rapidly approaching when our various kinds of philanthropic work in connection with missions will be past, except in emergencies. These lines of work will naturally be taken up by the peoples of these lands. In Japan we have no part in the matter of primary education, now well cared for by the Government. We will not need to minister to the needy of

Japan. But Japan will continue to need spiritual guidance and help, and the missionary may be needed long after the other tasks no longer exist. This philanthropic motive has been compelling in our day. Many people took some part in missions because they heard the recital of the above facts. Yet it is self-evident that this is not a final or essential motive in missions. An attitude of pity is not altogether desirable. As a result of the recital of the above facts, we have developed a paternal attitude toward peoples in mission lands. Appreciation and respect is far more desirable than mere pity. The latter produces condescension and the idea of inferiority. Paternalism and an air of superiority have had too large a place in missions. Today such an attitude is impossible. The peoples we seek to help have developed a strong national consciousness and are naturally proud of their past achievements. Another attitude than that of pity now becomes essential.

There is already evidence that mission work will gradually cease to be so largely philanthropic. The missionary is a vital factor in changing conditions of poverty and illiteracy. In this field he is making himself unnecessary. But we must not be foolish enough to believe that with the change of these conditions that the need of the missionary will no longer exist. Spiritual poverty will be a fact long after physical conditions are abated. The day is rapidly approaching when the missionary may more fully give himself to the spiritual witness rather than to serve tables.

4. *The Spiritual Motive.* We now come to the last and most essential missionary motive which we denominate as the spiritual. In discussing the motive of St. Paul and the early Church, we came in sight of this

fundamental factor. Our purpose is now to analyze and describe this motive more fully.

It is extremely important that the Church recognizes that the essential missionary impulse is spiritual in character and grows out of the deepest fundamentals of our Christian faith and experience. In the final analysis the missionary movement can only succeed as long as this spiritual aim and impulse is kept in view. If missions are not rooted in profound spiritual teachings and a genuine religious experience, there is little hope of permanence or success. Unless this motive springs naturally from the fundamentals of the faith, we cannot hope to manufacture it by artificial means. We have had far too much mere propaganda, based upon certain external factors, and not nearly enough effort to relate our movement to Christian fundamentals. We have said, "Look here and look there," when the Kingdom is really within us. There is no possibility of creating and maintaining the impulse in people aside from such fundamental truth and religious experience. Our most important task in missions is to get back to fundamentals in both faith and experience. The great ideas of Christianity must be reinterpreted and their missionary implication faced.

What are those fundamentals of Christian faith out of which the missionary obligation emerges?

(1) *The Character of God.* What we believe about God is of supreme significance, and if one comes to believe in the Christian God, he cannot refuse to be missionary. We believe in a God who is the God of all men. Beside Him there is no other. He is the Father of all men, but millions do not know their relationship to Him. Moreover, this God and Father of Jesus Christ is a Being vitally concerned about men, their

lives and destinies. He is no idle spectator in the presence of suffering and need. He is always seeking to reveal Himself and give Himself to the needy. He does not even leave the sinner alone, but pursues after him, to offer life and salvation. He is no Hindu Brahman so engaged in profound meditation that He cannot consider human suffering. Nor is He a harsh God like Allah, pronouncing judgment on sinners. He is a God of love, and this love extends to all men. He is the good shepherd going out into the storm to find and bring back the wandering sheep, and cannot rest until He finds them. God is more anxious to find men than men are to find God. If the God of Jesus is thus a going God, a pursuing, seeking God, does it not follow that all His children shall have the same quality? The likeness of this Christian God cannot be found in other religions or philosophies. It is the proclamation of this Christian God that constitutes our missionary task. Indeed, we might limit our task to the preaching of the God who was like Jesus, and whom we know through the life and teachings of Jesus. For some reason, the Hebrew and Greek races have come by a nobler conception of God, which we call the Christian God, and it is our duty to make this conception known. If we have anything in the Western world which we are obligated to share, it certainly is this conception of God. This is of far more moment than sharing our commerce, inventions, and sciences. If our God is not different, then our going is at least not so urgent.

We find ourselves in agreement with Dr. Robert E. Speer when he declares that, " It is the very being and character of God that the deepest ground of the missionary enterprise is to be found. We cannot think of God except in terms which necessitate the missionary

idea." (See *Christianity and the Nations*, p. 18). It is rank inconsistency in us as Christians to proclaim such a conception of God and not accept the obligation of proclaiming the truth to the ends of the earth by every honourable means. So, first of all, our missionary incentive grows out of what we believe about God.

(2) *The Saviourhood of Jesus Christ.* But it is also true that the missionary obligation grows out of our acceptance of the *universal saviourhood of Jesus Christ.* Either we must admit the falsity of this claim for Jesus Christ, or accept the task of making that saviourhood known to all men.

We have seen how the early Church was convinced that Jesus was the Messiah-Saviour. They believed Him to have all the value and meaning of God. In no small sense it was a new value and meaning of God they found. They saw that God, the eternal Father, was a being like Christ. They began to believe in a Christlike God. It was this God with all the qualities of Jesus they preached. This new conception of God caught the imagination of the Roman world. They found forgiveness and peace in this Messiah-Saviour. They immediately had a sense of obligation to make Him known everywhere.

Dr. Speer declares that it was not through any command of Jesus that they became missionary, but through what they believed him to be. It was what He was that compelled obedience. From this point of view we can best appreciate the loyalty to Jesus which possessed the early Church. We have said above that the chief factor with the early Christians was this sense of loyalty to Jesus Christ. For them it was not loyalty to a common cause, but loyalty to a Person. This

loyalty to Jesus as a Person is the finest thing we know in history.

For these Christians, Jesus was the world's hope. They believed that in Him all men would find full salvation. His saviourhood was universal. His death was for all men. Such conviction involved missionary obligation and required a missionary programme. To be a Christian was to share this passion of Jesus for a lost humanity. Not to share it was to be disloyal and fail Him. With St. Paul, all Christians are to fill up the measure of His sufferings for a lost world. Thus the true missionary and true evangelist has felt himself allied with Jesus for the redemption of the world. Here we get at that throbbing heart of early Christianity and to regain or recreate that passion in Christians today is our pressing necessity. We shall not reach the momentum the cause of missions requires except as we recreate the burning passion of the early followers. The burning passion which possessed them is impossible except as we become convinced of the great fundamentals of our faith even as they were.

(3) *Christian Experiences of Salvation in Christ.* We now seek to move one step farther into the heart of this thing we call missionary motive. Back of what men believe about God and what they believe about Jesus Christ is a definite, conscious, and all-compelling religious experience. St. Paul, in explaining his own unflagging zeal for the work, declared that he was constrained by the love of Christ. If he were mad, as his enemies declared, his madness was due to the measure in which he was possessed by the spirit of Jesus. He never tired of confessing the redeeming love of God in Christ as the central motivation of his life. The beautiful obedience and loyalty to Christ, which he illus-

trated, was born in his heart through the mystical experience of Christ's saving grace. Having had this experience, he simply had to be an evangelist and win others to the same experience.

It is, then, when men consciously share in the life of God that they inevitably become interested in their fellow-men and have a passion for service. A man cannot share that passion for sacrificial service except as he shares the life of God. The deepest motive is found in this redemptive experience. This experience of redemptive grace was the compelling power among the early Christians. Can there be any substitute for it today or ever?

Thus it appears that the deepest missionary impulse is spiritual, and takes its rise in spiritual truth and spiritual experience. This religious experience rests back upon what God is to us in Christ. This God revealed in Christ is an active, ever-working God, giving Himself to men wherever they seek Him. Among the many fruits of the spirit is this missionary impulse which true Christians have always recognized.

It now becomes apparent that the deepest urge to missions can never be found in facts of outward life, of physical and intellectual need, but is found in our fellowship with God in Christ. There is a call of the world, but the impulse to answer that call must come from the heart of God Himself.

III

ESSENTIAL MISSIONARY AIMS

1. Introductory Statement of the Problem

WE are in sore need of re-defining our missionary task. There is much difference of opinion and not a little confusion about our aims. It is extremely important that we re-evaluate our whole enterprise in view of changed conditions throughout the world and the serious criticism now falling upon that enterprise. It should be possible, after a century and a quarter of Protestant work, to know more definitely what ends ought to be achieved. Our main objectives should stand out clearly. It is evident that much of the criticism directed against missions is really directed against phases of the work that are purely incidental or which have now been left behind. Many of them have little or no force when analyzed. But we need to define our problem, not chiefly in view of criticism, but in order to save our energies and not exhaust ourselves in tasks that have little or no bearing upon the deeper aims of the movement. We shall here, first of all, note some supposed aims of missions, and then take up the fundamental aims of Christian missions in the light of our present experience.

2. Some Negative Aspects of Missions

1. *Not to Carry Western Theology.* That in the early stages of Protestant work missionaries consid-

ered it their duty to impart theological ideas like those held in the church they represented cannot be regarded as unnatural. Some of these, no doubt, were very insistent upon what they considered to be the inspired theology of their denomination. However, a review of missionary history reveals the fact that the greatest missionaries were not such hard and fast dogmatists as might appear. Men like Carey, Morrison, and Livingstone held in a general way to the doctrines of the churches in England, but they were not bigoted dogmatists.

It is forgotten on both sides of this controversy that if missionaries went to Oriental peoples at all, they would, of necessity, carry something of theology, ecclesiasticism, and civilization. They could not help doing so. If they were to teach the doctrines of Christianity, they could only do this as they had learned those doctrines.

There is still much to complain about in this connection. However, the most influential leaders of missions see clearly enough that the Oriental races must interpret Christianity for themselves, before it can become a vital thing to them. They are not, therefore, insistent upon their particular interpretations. Farsighted missionaries feel that their task is to present the simplest essentials and to allow their students liberty to think through the various doctrines for themselves. Some can still be found today who insist upon the infallibility of creeds, either old or new. But the discerning missionary is not especially concerned to impose his creeds on his converts. Probably many missionaries have had sharp disappointment because their converts so readily accepted all they were taught without adapting it to themselves.

But we here remind ourselves, and our Christian brothers in all lands, that nineteen hundred years of theological study in the West must have very great value for them and for us. By this we do not mean to bind anybody to accept Western interpretations. We do insist, however, that our Western efforts cannot be thrown aside as worthless. We agree with E. Stanley Jones when he declares: "We are not there to give India a blocked-off, rigid, ecclesiastical or theological system, saying to them, 'Take that in its entirety or nothing!'" (*Christ of the Indian Road,* p. 33.) We now favour the fullest liberty to the Oriental Christians to read and interpret for themselves. We fully expect India, China, and Japan to make helpful expositions of Christianity, though we have had disappointment in this hope so far. We agree that our theological conclusions are not infallible. It must not be assumed that their views will entirely supersede ours or possess any larger measure of infallibility than ours. In some quarters the idea prevails that these peoples will find the Christian system easy to interpret and easy to live. It is inferred that they will far surpass us in both particulars. Let us hope that with our experience at their disposal, they may surpass us, but there are as yet no grounds for this supposition.

For the future, it will not be one of our fundamental aims to carry some particular theological system to the Eastern peoples. We shall be satisfied to place the Bible in their hands in their own tongue and ask them to read and interpret for themselves. As the Gospel is studied in relation to their genius and past experience, new light may be expected to break forth from that Gospel. We will give them the results of our thinking, but we will not insist upon their accepting it. Full

freedom to interpret the Gospel must be accorded them.

2. *Not to Carry Western Ecclesiasticism.* That some churchmen have believed the establishment of the Western church an essential in missions may be conceded. On the whole, too much stress has been laid upon the importance of transplanting the Western church to the East. It was natural for a time that the various churches should be reproduced. However, this was not due so much to a conviction that such reproduction was necessary as to the fact that it was easy. Missionaries would not likely think out some different or new organization, but they would revamp their home organizations and make them serve their converts. In the main, the Western churches have been reproduced. In theory we Protestants do not believe in the divine origin or appointment of our church organizations. One kind of organization is as good as another in theory. Consistency requires that we grant complete freedom in the organization of the Church. We should say to our converts, "Take from us what you want, but also leave what you do not want." Surely we should desire that they have a church in harmony with their national genius and racial gifts.

Church leaders understand today that our denominational divisions have little or no value for the Orient. Orientals are not interested in the questions which separate us. We shall not therefore insist upon the reproduction of our Western denominations. We believe this is the view of most missionaries today. We have no desire to fasten all these denominations upon India or China. Rev. E. Stanley Jones has expressed the general attitude when he says: "We will put our

civilization and our ecclesiastical systems at the disposal of India to take as much as may suit their purposes. But we do not insist upon these. We will give them Christ, and urge them to interpret Him through their own genius and life. Then the interpretation will be first hand and vital." This expresses the view of the majority today. Whatever may have been true of the early days in Protestant missions, today we will not force our particular ecclesiastical establishment upon the East. Sheer honesty, however, compels us to recognize that so far the Christians of the Orient have not been original in Church matters, but have largely copied the fundamental Church types from the West. Even in Japan, where independent churches have arisen, they are essentially copies of the typical Western bodies. However, one cannot escape the impression that there is really not so much opposition to the churches organized in the mission fields as some would have us believe. The radicals have overworked this objection. As indicated above, in lands like Japan, where complete freedom to organize as nationals saw fit has been accorded, the churches founded have a strange likeness to those in the West. After all, the possible types have been pretty well exhausted, though new combinations might be effected.

Again, one cannot escape the conclusion that the attacks on denominationalism, as developed in the West, are also greatly overdone, and by no means sincere. When travellers refer to the confusion growing out of several denominations working in one country, they are, as a rule, exaggerating. As Dr. R. E. Speer declares, "It is for the most part sheer nonsense." Rarely have the Christian bodies competed seriously. Moreover, as Dr. Speer so ably shows, the idea of sects

and denominations is as marked in Shinto, Buddhism, Hinduism, and Islam as in Christianity. None of these religionists can throw stones at Christians because of our churchly divisions. They have exactly the same situation, and if different at all, it is more marked than among Christians. But, notwithstanding this complete reply, we deplore our divisions and theirs, and if they can have Christianity without our divisions, which can mean but little to them, by all means let us encourage them to move in that direction and refrain from bringing any pressure on them to duplicate our divisions.

We are satisfied to raise up groups of Christians and allow them to form indigenous churches. We must sympathize with the rise of national churches throughout the mission fields, though we sincerely hope that they will maintain a larger unity than we have been able to do in the West. Churches which represent the genius and character of the Eastern peoples are far more desirable for them than our Western forms, however well the latter may be adapted to us.

3. *Not to Carry Western Civilization.* It seems to many today that the missionary movement is doomed because it is tied up with Western civilization. It becomes exceedingly important that this situation be examined carefully. To what extent is our missionary aim one of carrying Western civilization? Can our course be defended? Have we ever consciously gone to non-Christian lands expressly to introduce Western civilization? The assertion is frequently made that this is the chief aim of missions and that therefore missions are just a phase of Western imperialism. This whole matter of the relation of missions to civilization, either Western or Eastern, needs fuller and clearer exposition than has yet been given it. Some clear and

penetrating thinking is here required. Unquestionably a lot of foolish statements have been made in this connection by both the friends and enemies of missions. Proponents of missions in the home lands have talked glibly of taking the benefits of Western civilization to the benighted people of the Orient. Their chief appeal was made at this point. They said that Americans should make the benefits of civilization available to all peoples. On the other hand, missionaries sometimes gave reason for thinking that this was their chief errand. However, the fact remains that *no missionary society has ever considered this one of its fundamental aims. So far as missions have carried Western civilization, it has been incidental to their central purpose.*

The issue is acute today because the war has revealed the weaknesses of Western civilization, and this has opened an attack on the West such as we had not experienced. Western civilization has come in for a fearful castigation at the hands of both Westerners and Easterners. It is now popular to take a fling at everything Western, because it is Western. In this wholesale attack little reason or discrimination has been shown. Prejudice is a larger element than knowledge. Many contentions have little basis in fact. Western civilization is not usually pronounced worse than Oriental civilization, but it is criticized because it is not better than it is. It is held up to ridicule because it exhibits so many imperfections, but not because it is worse than some other. We have no brief for our civilization. To defend it is not a part of our plan. But any one who compares civilization East and West will still have occasion for praising many things Western. The present indiscriminate criticisms do not help. The value of certain elements in our Western

life is vastly underestimated. So far as this castigation drives us to purge Western civilization of its evils, it will be well; but with regard to actual truth and the facts involved, few criticisms have more fully missed the mark. A few years will bring a reversal on this issue.

It is needful that we visualize the missionary and his task in the earlier years. In the years 1885 to 1900, especially Western science and invention, its arts and discoveries, were being made known in the East quite largely through missionary channels. When these earlier workers landed in India and China, they were appalled at the conditions of life that existed. They found few schools and nearly one hundred per-cent illiteracy. They found no hospitals, but sick people on every side. They found all means of transportation antiquated. It naturally seemed to these missionaries that to open schools and erect hospitals and make known some of our technical discoveries was to do these peoples a real service. The need along these lines was so great that the missionaries were often turned aside from their original plans to do some of these practical things. They were the more inclined to do some one of these practical things because there was then no open door for preaching and teaching religion directly. Moreover, the nationals in all these lands were anxious to be initiated into the mysteries of Western civilization, including military science. They besieged the missionary to teach them English or German in order that they could get at the sources of Western civilization. In all probability the time will come when monuments will be erected to commemorate the labours of missionaries along these lines. It is certain that in introducing medicine, surgery, knowledge

of sanitation, Western education, science of agriculture, silk raising, transportation, telegraphs, and modern shipping facilities, and many other practical things, the missionary and other Westerners have done a good service to these peoples. These things would inevitably reach them, whether missionaries assisted or not. It was, on the whole, well that some of these elements of civilization came so largely through the missionary. Some day such builders as Verbeck in Japan, Timothy Richard in China, Dr. Scudder in India will attain full recognition and be regarded as humanitarian agents and true benefactors of these races.

It may be said that this is only one side of the story and that the missionary has also been associated with certain evils of Western life as well. We have indicated above the part played by a few missionaries in the political and diplomatic measures taken by Western powers. But the evils of industrialism, opium, tobacco, liquor, and militarism which have been directly introduced from the West have seldom ever been championed by missionaries and never by missionary societies or the Western churches. The whole missionary group at work in non-Christian lands must not be indicted because of a very few who may have helped one or more of these evils to gain entrance. Much less can the whole movement be convicted of major responsibility in this connection. For the most part missionaries have stuck to their job of declaring the Gospel. Incidentally they laboured to introduce the nobler elements of Western life. They have often fought nobly to protect these peoples from the evils of the West as well as the evils that were indigenous. The part taken in recent years in revealing the evils of industrialism and in proposing measures to avoid or

minimize those evils is most notable. They have not hesitated to reveal the evil part taken by Europeans or Americans in this matter. Such actions have often brought them into disrepute both with Europeans and nationals concerned.

We venture to say that another generation will see the contribution of the missionary in a very different light. The fogs of misunderstanding, racial bitterness, and national jealousies prevent a fair view of their labours. The thoughtful people of the Orient will be glad to admit their indebtedness to the West.

It may, therefore, be confidently asserted that to carry Western civilization, as such, has never been an aim of missions. That missions helped to carry elements of that civilization has been incidental to the movement, and not fundamental. Its central aim has been the planting of the Gospel of Jesus Christ in these lands. Such a presentation of Christianity could not be wholly separated from the spread of Western civilization. The spread of Western civilization has been coincident with missions. Our missionaries of necessity became bearers of that civilization in measure, though they had not thought of putting that at the forefront of their plans. When people go from their own lands to dwell in another land, they inevitably carry elements of the mother country with them.

It may be wise today to disavow much that Western nations have wrought in the non-Christian lands and to disentangle our enterprise from politics, economic issues, diplomatic questions, and all sinister effect of commerce as far as possible. However, the complète severance will not be possible. We will continue to be a part of life in these lands. The desirable thing is that we may discern the good from the evil and give

our support only to the good. That the missionary movement does not give encouragement to the vicious elements in Western life must become known ere long. Whether looked at from one angle or another, there is no serious occasion for attack on missions on this ground.

3. A Constructive Statement of Fundamental Missionary Aims

Having recognized some of the criticisms of missionary aims and having replied to them, we are now ready to examine constructively the task of missions. We propose to examine the various aims which have found expression in connection with the movement. Later we shall discuss some possible aims which today loom upon the horizon and seek to anticipate the more special aims of tomorrow.

Aim No. 1: The Evangelization of the World

(1) *What Does the Term Evangelization Mean?* We have been accustomed to say that our aim is the evangelization of the world. At once we have need to define the term evangelization before we can proceed, for very different ideas of the term exist. There are two pretty well defined interpretations of evangelization within the churches.

(a) *The Heralding Theory.* By this is meant a mere proclamation of the Gospel to the non-Christian peoples, and is perhaps to be done orally. It stresses the need of raising up a witness, rather than the conversion of the people. This view virtually means that a brief and meagre preaching of the Gospel in a community may serve as a witness and that is all we are to do.

After a proclamation in a village or city, then move on to another. Perhaps they have in mind such a preaching as Jonah did in Nineveh and that this might be all that is required for evangelization. This will be enough to place them under condemnation if they reject it. But who can believe that this is all that missions are expected to accomplish?

It is evident that this view rests upon or grows out of a millenarian theology. Such advocates are primarily concerned about the visible return of Jesus to the earth. Before such a consummation can be realized, the Gospel must be preached to all nations "as a witness." The present world-order can thus be brought to an end. The Lord reigning in person upon the earth will then secure the conversion of the nations. Large results are not expected in this dispensation. The preaching will only serve to call out the body of the elect. The real conversion must come later. Haste is the watchword of this group. Superficiality is certain to mark their efforts. They do not favour establishing institutions. There is no time for a long programme. No far-reaching plans need to be matured. What is done, must be done quickly, as Jesus is at the door.

(b) *The Planting Theory.*[1] This view rejects much of the above and does not believe that evangelization can be either so easily or quickly accomplished. Such superficial knowledge of Christianity, as the other view contemplates, is not worth while. Moreover, we do not think people can be so summarily dealt with and so placed under condemnation. This view holds that we are to continue preaching and teaching in a given place until some fair measure of knowledge is created.

[1] For fuller exposition of these views, see *Study of Christian Missions,* by W. N. Clarke.

Contrary to the other view, it expects large results even under present conditions. The Gospel is regarded as seed to be sown in the soil of the nations in the hope that it will become acclimated and finally indigenous to the soil. It is hoped that the vine thus raised up will become naturalized both as to climate and soil, and having become naturalized, will spread rapidly in the soil. But much care will be needed, especially in the beginnings. Once really indigenous, it will spread naturally and widely.

This view assumes that there will be some organization of the converts and believers in institutions which will make training of leaders possible and such other institutions as may be needed, such as schools, hospitals, printing presses, libraries, and churches. According to this view, missions are not an *ad interim* affair to be discarded presently, but the beginnings of a programme which will not end until the nations are essentially Christian. It assumes that the forces for establishing the Kingdom of God in the world are now available. The chief duty of Christians is to lay hold upon these forces and utilize them. Naturally we contemplate a long period of effort. While obeying the injunction to be ready for all events, so far as human eyes can see, the process of making the world Christian cannot be a short one. It is therefore not content with makeshift programmes, but believes in laying broad and strong foundations. *To publish the Christian Scriptures* in all the languages of the earth as soon as possible in order that men may get the message of Christ in the tongues in which they were born is a part of the task. This may be described as a minimum aim of the missionary enterprise, but is too important to be passed over. No more romantic story can be related

than that of making the Bible available to men in their own tongues. This work is so central to missions and so significant for world evangelization that we ought to give a brief chapter to it. Here we may merely note it as one of the fundamental objectives in missions. Here is the one piece of missionary work which has met with no opposition. On all sides this is regarded as an important and essential feature of the work.

We believe that the latter view of evangelization is in accord with the mind of Christ. It is unbelievable that He would cut men off and bring them to judgment on any superficial and inadequate preaching of the Gospel or without having a very real opportunity to know and believe. He is not come to " condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved." So great a responsibility cannot so easily be laid upon people to whom the whole story of the Gospel is new. When the difficulties of language and thought forms are considered, one shrinks from the idea that casual hearing will be enough to condemn them. The task of teaching the Gospel to the world so that it may be understood is very great, but we must not hesitate for that reason. If we were in the position of the non-Christians, we certainly would expect God to give us an adequate chance to know and believe. The heralding view does not contemplate making the Christian message known in any adequate sense. The planting theory does contemplate an adequate presentation of the Gospel. This theory naturally fits in with the theology of the Protestant churches. It assumes that the Kingdom is here in a measure now and is coming. It holds that all power is given into Christ's hands. He is now on the throne. He is exalted to the right hand of God and in His hand is the destiny of the

world. He is the sovereign Lord, no longer suffering humiliation, but ascended and glorified. He is Captain of the hosts and will lead on until His Gospel is lodged in the hearts of men everywhere.

2. *The Stages of Missionary Work Suggested by Great Commission.* This passage is found in each of the synoptic Gospels, and for our present purpose questions of its origin need not be considered. It represents apostolic conviction at any rate, and is extremely important for us. This passage, especially as given in Matthew, may be taken as indicating the aim and scope of the missionary endeavour. The aim and scope as it existed in the mind of the early Church is of vast importance to us. We therefore propose to consider briefly the three steps or stages there suggested.

The first step is to " make disciples of the nations." This means to make inquirers of them, learners, hearers. It indicates that there must be a period of instruction. Now this process may be longer or shorter. In a sense this part of the task is now on. We are today seeking to teach men the rudiments of the Gospel. There is a general desire in most parts of the non-Christian world to investigate the Gospel. Many hundreds of thousands are today reading the Bible. Christianity is a subject of keen interest on the part of most educated men. Many of these have in their hearts accepted Christ. Not many have as yet openly acknowledged their discipleship. Never before has there been such a demand for the Christian Bible as today. Nations are being discipled through that agency alone. There are untold thousands who are ready to take the next step, namely, to be baptized and enrolled in the Christian Church. This stage of the work of evangelization might be said to be well toward

completion. Says Professor E. C. Moore: "Beyond a certain point, which point is in some lands already reached, evangelization is the task of the native and not the foreigner. The task of the missionary is in raising up, educating, guiding, and inspiring the evangelists. In any case, evangelization is not Christianization. Evangelization may be in some cases the task of but a few years. Christianization is the task of the ages" (*West and East*, p. 92). Again he says: "If the mere proclamation of the Gospel, which is a beginning, were to be the end, it would be a singularly fruitless end. The fruit of true evangelization must always be Christianization" (p. 93). We must surely agree that if we were to go no further than mere proclamation, then the task would be fruitless. We may rejoice that the work has gone so far toward the first stage of the process, but we must not conclude that since we have now preached to great masses of men, and the rudiments of the Gospel have been taught, the work of evangelization is finished. Evidently this is the thought of not a few workers. But we have only made a beginning of the task. In the second and third states we shall be doing a different type of work, and in the last stage especially the function of the missionary is quite altered, but we shall not have finished the task of full evangelization until we have gone far beyond this disciplining stage.

The second stage is that of definite decision among inquirers and their open confession of Christ in Christian baptism. "Baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." The command is to disciple and then to "baptize them." Evidently this second step should be impossible until they accomplished the first. All missionary history

warns against the baptism of people in large numbers who have not actually been prepared for it by careful teaching and training. It may well be asked whether we are not now going too fast in this matter of baptisms in some fields. If we enroll a host of people who do not even have the rudiments of the faith we are sure to regret it. There is also the danger of mass movements such as are common today in certain fields. Fortunately, baptism stands for a good deal more in mission fields than it does at home. It means there the stepping across the line into the Christian fold in a public manner, and hence the separation from their old communities. This act does not mean so much to primitive folk or to outcast peoples who already suffer under great disabilities, but to the educated classes who have social standing and influence, it is very serious. No wonder many of these hesitate long before taking the step. Baptisms are now frequent in most fields. However, we must not forget that the early missionaries waited many years, in some cases a life-time, before they had the joy of seeing one baptism. The situation is most encouraging today. The sowing of past years is beginning to yield a bountiful harvest. The teaching of the years has not been lost, but is now bringing the results desired.

But this commission passage suggests a further state. It commands us to "Disciple the nations," "to baptize the nations," and then "to teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." This is indeed a vast extension of evangelization. That process is not completed when the inquirer is baptized and received into the Church. We have noted that baptism always involves the organized Church in some form, and much in the way of institutionalism may well

attend the second stage of the programme. But it is to be observed that the commission includes the further training and development of converts until they practice what Christ teaches. In some Roman Catholic fields (Europe) our work is entirely or at least largely in this third stage. Our candidates are persons who know the rudiments of the Gospel and are acquainted with the Church and have been baptized but have never been taught to observe all things. With these we certainly have a work to do. Very properly such work is included in the programme of world-evangelization. In the final analysis we should not think we have evangelized until we have baptized and received into the Church and have trained into full-fledged Christians.

This may seem like proposing an impossible missionary programme. It is indeed much simpler to talk of merely heralding the Gospel and divesting ourselves of much responsibility as to whether or not men are converted. But evidently this was not in the mind of the early Church. The writers of the Gospels were thinking of a far-extending programme which would not be completed until men were actually Christians, living as Christians ought to live. Now we ask, " Can anything short of this long programme be termed evangelization? " The more closely the other view is examined the more clearly it appears that it is built on false premises. Are we not bound as Christians to secure the largest possible Christian opportunity for the peoples? Can we ever rest in any short-sighted programme? Could we ever feel our duty discharged until we have invested them with every Christian privilege that we ourselves enjoy?

3. *Evangelization of the World in This Generation.* It will appear from this discussion that the view which

regards missions as an effort to evangelize only and is not concerned about the further task of Christianization is not the one that we can accept. For the sake of clearer definition we may mark the stages as above, but the task of missions broadly considered will go on indefinitely, being a permanent aspect of the Church's life in any particular land. It will after a time take on a different form, methods and policies will vary, and may become, as we shall see, a partnership affair, a giving and a receiving process to which there will be no end. Our real goal is not evangelization, defined as a preachment merely, but Christianization. This goal cannot be attained quickly, and all indications that it can and the task of missions become complete, is fatal to the building of a correct attitude in our churches at home. The giving and receiving programme must go on while the world lasts. Working together, we shall achieve the Kingdom of God on earth.

The student of missions cannot but regard all emphasis on missions as an *ad interim* affair as most unfortunate. We heard much about the evangelization of the world in this generation. The watchword of the Student Volunteer Movement was presumptuous. It developed in minds which did not have historic perspective. It gave the impression that the task of missions could be achieved quickly. It savoured far too much of the heralding theory. It had an unconscious basis in millenarian ideas. Many persons thought if we made one big united effort, the task would be done and the missionary goal reached. Part of the disillusionment about missions today is at this point. We are apparently no nearer the goal of missions than we were a generation ago. When we had reason to expect

the end of the task, it appears as larger and more difficult than ever before.

The only soundness in that watchword was in the note of immediacy it struck. So far as it helped to arouse the Church to the urgency of missionary duty, we may accord it value. As Dr. Warneck says: "If the watchword of this movement is so understood that we, the generation now living, feel responsible for the work of missions to the non-Christian world, and consequently must act with all our strength and earnestness, then we are quite agreed." . . . Then he went on to point out the foolishness of taking it as an indication that the work could be finished in a generation. It was poor teaching on missions, but was useful in helping to overcome the lethargy of the churches. It was a good piece of propaganda, but gave a wrong idea of the missionary task.

Aim No. 2: The Raising Up of An Indigenous Church

From the beginning of modern Protestant missions an avowed aim has been the establishment of the Church in all lands. No one seriously questioned the desirability of accomplishing this end. Only in the last few years has it been called in question. Most of the older writers on missions were quite clear and definite on this issue. Dr. Anderson, of the Presbyterian Board, writing in 1886, said: "The grand object of foreign missions is to plant and multiply churches composed of native converts, each church complete in itself, with presbyters of the same race, left to determine their ecclesiastical relations for themselves, with the aid of judicious advice from their missionary fathers. . . ." This expresses the view held in most quarters in that

day. This writer is believed to be the first to use the terms self-governing, self-supporting, and self-propagating church, and these terms have had a very wide acceptance as describing what we hope to see in our churches.

Another aspect of the Church theory was set forth by Dr. Lawrence, which he declares had been well recognized from the year 1856, if not earlier. He says: " God's great agent for the spread of His Kingdom is His Church. In every land He operates through the Church, and missions operate distinctly for the Church. Every church should work out into a mission and every mission into a church. . . . The primary aim of missions is to preach the Gospel in all lands; the ultimate aim is to plant the Church in all lands. When they have done that, their task is accomplished. Then the church of each land, thus planted, must win its own people to Christ. The converts must convert, the new church must evangelize and Christianize. India, China, Japan are each to be turned to Christ, not by missions but by the Indians, the Chinese, the Japanese churches, when these churches have been securely planted by missions." (See *Mission Problems,* by A. Pieters.)

We cannot fail to be impressed with the clearness with which the church establishment theory is here expressed. In large measure these statements were prophetic and set forth a very important aim of missions, though there are suggestions here with which we may not fully accord today. We would not say that God only works through His Church. We see His mighty acts in other connections. But we can agree with most that is declared concerning the raising up of a church in non-Christian countries, and the importance of such

a church in the further evangelization and Christianization of that land. Whether the mother churches are to withdraw after the mission church is founded may be doubted, in view of our experience in late years.

Dr. W. N. Clark expresses a similar view when he says: "We may say that the object in Christian missions is the raising-up and training of a body of Christian people who can carry on the Christian work of their own country. This is the first step in planting Christianity." It was self-evident to these earlier students of the movement that our first goal would be the creation of an outward and visible Church as a centre of the further evangelization of the country. The sore criticism had not yet fallen upon the Church that we hear about today. They regarded the Church as worthy of reproduction in non-Christian lands. No doubt they thought that the form of church organization they represented would be acceptable to their converts.

As an ideal or goal in missionary work there was much to recommend this view. That Christianity would find expression in and through an organization seemed certain. The idea associated with the Church that it would assume the task of complete evangelization was correct even by our standards today. The view was amiss in its apparent assurance that our Western churches could be directly transplanted and flourish in the new soil. In general, we are ready to agree with this as a first goal in missions.

The chief characteristics of the churches to be raised up were: (1) self-support, (2) self-propagation, (3) and self-government. These have been the terms in which we have described the Church we hoped to found. These terms represent ideals worthy of em-

phasis, and it is fortunate they have been kept in the foreground so constantly. This indigenous church has arrived on the advanced fields, and is at once the hope and the peril of this hour in missions. We now face a new danger. It is that the Western churches will now feel that they can withdraw from these newly founded churches. We must stand by these churches not only in moral support, but in material support long after they are organized. We must continue to place at the disposal of these indigenous churches all our experience in matters of doctrine, organization, ritual, music, and architecture. In doing so they will be under no obligation to take these and use them, except in so far as they believe that our experience will aid them.

We do not here propose a discussion of the indigenous church or the problems it raises. We are here concerned with fundamental aims in missions and believe we must include in the list the raising-up of a church in the mission fields. We shall see in our next paragraph that a new missionary aim is being recognized today, which might remove this ideal from our plans.

Since the above paragraph was written, the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church adopted the following statement of the aims in missions. The same statement has been adopted by the Presbyterian Church and others:

"The supreme and controlling aim of foreign missions is to make the Lord Jesus Christ known to all men as their Divine Saviour and to persuade them to become His disciples; to gather these disciples into Christian churches which shall be self-propagating, self-supporting, and self-governing; to co-operate as long as necessary, with these churches in the evan-

gelizing of their countrymen, and in bringing to bear on all human life the spirit and principles of Christ."

Aim No. 3: The Ideal of Spiritual Interpenetration

In earlier years we talked about the conversion of the non-Christian peoples and meant something very definite by the term conversion. We believed that conversion was to mean a personal acceptance of Christ and a personal commitment to Christ. It was also expected that such a convert would cease to be a Hindu, Mohammedan, or Buddhist and come out from his ancestral faith and take an open stand for Christ and the Church. This definite stand would be marked by the ordinance of baptism.

Today there is marked tendency to speak of a general permeation of peoples by the Christian spirit and idealism. We have had constant emphasis on the scope and significance of this very general sort of conversion to Christian ideals. No one has openly called the presentation in question. Some years ago we were aroused with stories of individual conversion, and the development of Christian character in men and women who had definitely committed themselves to Christ. Today we hear less about individual conversions and far more about social, political, and industrial changes, along with assurances that India and China are rapidly accepting Christian ideals. Proponents of missions may well find food for thought in this situation. The social Gospel ideal has now secured the central position in missionary aim. We now need to inquire what is involved in the new aim we describe with the word "interpenetration."

This new point of view raises several difficult questions upon which the wisest and best of our missionaries would differ. Is it necessary to conversion that men shall break with their ancestral faiths, or might we consider them as Christians, even though they retained old affiliations as Hindus or Mohammedans? Do we expect more than that they will receive the idealism of Jesus? Should we urge them to break with the indigenous systems of religion, seeing that they have caught the idealism of Jesus? Will they be just as well off if they don't, and would such a programme be just as good as any other? Shall baptism mark separation from ancestral faiths and most of its practices? Should the missionary insist upon baptism and nominal affiliation with some branch of the Christian Church? Is it possible that these men and women who have caught the spiritual idealism of Jesus might serve the Kingdom of God better by maintaining old affiliations? Those who favour such an ideal in missions would put the question thus: Do we desire that men shall accept the spirit of Jesus, or accept the forms, creeds, and ceremonies of the Church? We do not think this a fair statement of the options involved, but we are willing to let that pass for the present. As leaders of the Christian movement in non-Christian lands, we must decide whether institutional Christianity is desirable or not. Is a Christianity that never incarnates itself in institutions worth while? Will a Christianity so nebulous as this stand the test of time? Will it not be swallowed up completely by some of the many religious currents common in these lands? What about a propagating centre? Will such a nebulous Christianity continue to spread itself or perish where it is born?

These are some of the questions we need to have in mind when we listen to discussions on the permeation of India with the spirit of Jesus. Such discussions lay little or no stress on baptism or church relationship. Possibly that must come later. The emphasis on accepting Jesus is good, but can it stop there? Emphasis upon the inner spirit of religion, as against creeds, formulas, and ceremonies has its value, and with it we have a natural sympathy. However, if the conversion of India is to mean more than a grafting of the Christianity onto Hinduism, is not some line of demarkation needed? Leaders of Indian and Chinese religion believe that Christianity is not destined to any separate existence in those lands, but will make merely a contribution to religious ideals and finally be swallowed up. Earlier Christianity in China suffered that fate. The same thing practically happened to early Christianity in India. Can we expect any other result if the idea of " interpenetration " is to be our guide?

The triumph of Christianity, of which we hear, is of the same sort. Christ is being talked about, studied, and to a certain extent His spirit is permeating the ideals of India. But we need to put alongside of this statement the further fact that with the majority of these there is no personal acceptance or commitment to Christ. Are we satisfied with this situation?

In the hazy sense here indicated, all Asia may be said to be accepting Jesus Christ. On all sides men are reading His life and teaching. They are, on the whole, pleased with it. They are ready to accept it, provided nothing is said about proselytism. They distinctly resent the suggestion that they should quit ancestral faiths. They desire to embody the idealism of Jesus and call it Hinduism or Confucianism. Now it is won-

derful that the person of Jesus is so attractive and His idealism so acceptable. Perhaps nothing like it can be seen in the world. In a sense, it is a sweeping victory for Jesus. But is it the kind of a triumph we desire to see? Are we satisfied to drop emphasis on personal acceptance of Christ and alliance with His Church? Will a victory won on this basis be a victory at all in the long run? Does it not mean that the Orient is adding another figure to its crowded pantheon? Will not Jesus be on a level with the rest? Will He not be just another mystical saint?

It is very likely that the majority who thus nominally accept the idealism of Jesus will make but little effort to live out that idealism. In England and America we have millions of men who nominally accept the ideals of Jesus but fail totally to embody those ideals in life. Is it very important to secure nominal acceptance of those teachings anywhere? Is it not worth more to get one man to actually commit himself to Christ and His programme and set him earnestly at the task of living that creed than to make a hundred nominal believers?

If the Christian aim is lowered to suit this temper, what assurance will there be of Christ or Christianity being perpetuated? Will not those fine ideals implanted through missionary teaching be lowered and brought into line with Asian ideals, and their power and beauty impaired? Is it not imperative that they be enshrined in some institution? Unless some sort of churches exist to make them effective, is there not every reason for believing they will be lost?

When the whole matter is analyzed, are we not compelled to demand that men commit themselves to Christ as Master and Lord? Will not such committal

imply union with an institution that stands to embody and express the ideals of Jesus? Can we do less than ask men to be converted and fully to consecrate themselves to Christ as Lord? Such emphasis is in grave danger today in view of the nebulous notion of Christian idealism or spiritual interpenetration current.

We must accord hearty agreement with those missionaries who make Jesus the central fact of their preaching. Emphasis on His beauty, power and personality is certainly desirable. However, the question does not easily down as to whether they can make such a separation between Christ and Christianity as they attempt to make. If Jesus has so totally failed in our Western Christianity, as some of them indicate, it is doubtful whether He can be successful in the East, as they infer. If the trial of Christianity for so many centuries in the West has been so utterly disappointing as they declare, one is left wondering whether it is worth revamping for the East. We are inclined to think that the value of Western Christianity is surely underestimated. Its value for the Orient is very much greater than many now admit. One is ready to venture the opinion that the radical disparagement of Western theology, ecclesiasticism, and civilization, so often voiced in these days, is hardly justified.

We hear today that *India will accept Christ, but not Christianity.* It is *also suggested that India will accept Jesus, but not Christ.* It is declared by Mr. Natarajan, editor of the *Indian Reformer,* that " instead of throwing Christianity overboard, India's educated men have begun to make a distinction between the Christ of Christendom, and the Jesus of the Gospel. The former they will not touch, but the latter is drawing them more

and more." Another Indian writer affirms that "an educated Indian would like to be and attempts to be, something like Christ, but he has no desire to be called a Christian." In these statements we have an expression of the nausea many feel about organized Christianity in the West. We venture, in all kindness of spirit, to say that such statements are possible only to those who have immature notions of Christian ideals and standards. It is to be noted that Christianity in the West is not condemned in view of Hindu idealism and Hindu realization or when compared with other systems, but in view of its failure to reach up to Jesus Christ—the religion of the Sermon on the Mount. In all such declarations there is an easy assumption that Indians will do better. We do not desire to be critical toward our Indian or Chinese publicists, but feel called upon to say that they have as yet no adequate idea how difficult the standards of Jesus are in a world like ours. Indians have not gone far in applying those noble ideals, but as they attempt to do so and realize how difficult it is, they will have far more sympathy with our Western efforts to reach up toward an understanding of Jesus. In the long run this distinction between Christ and Christianity will not be convincing. We cannot help believing that our Western efforts to follow Christ have far more significance than is admitted just now.

If by taking the Jesus of the Gospels it is meant that they have an understanding of Jesus which we have never possessed, we may be forgiven if we express doubt. There is hardly any new interpretation of Jesus possible. During the ages we have had every shade of opinion. It often seems to the adolescent mind that He can be taken merely as an ideal, an example, and

teacher, and nothing need be affirmed about His person. But all experience shows that such a view will not be satisfying. Making just a man of Him involves the validity and integrity of the records and His earliest interpreters. It does not simplify the problem to declare Him simply human. On that basis there is no construction of the Gospel records nor of later history possible. Our friends in India and China are certain to find this out a little later, and then they will respect Western theology a good deal more than at present.

When it is affirmed that a new interpretation of Christianity is developing in the Orient, we can only hope it is so. So far, there has been but little ground for the statement. The Indians, Chinese, and Japanese are all a disappointment to us in that they have not exhibited originality in interpreting Christianity as we had hoped. It is a noteworthy observation that this attitude toward Western Christianity was current in Japan twenty years ago, but does not find expression so often today. The Japanese have made trial of their prowess and have learned to be more humble. They know they are dealing with a bigger matter than they supposed. They now know that to interpret, to teach and to live Christianity is a difficult task. They are less assertive than their neighbours. Not a single noteworthy heresy has yet developed among Protestant missions unless this Jesus vs. Christianity issue can be called such. We advise our friends in India to proceed in their investigations. They must have full freedom in re-thinking the Gospel. We bid them God's speed in their attempt to embody the idealism of Jesus. In the meantime, we who seem to have so utterly failed must crave their sympathy.

The idea of simply penetrating the mind of India or

China with the spirit of Jesus is at first attractive. Yet we do not feel that such an aim is adequate. We may rejoice in the impact the spirit and message of Jesus is making. The creation of sympathy toward Jesus is certainly good. To secure attention to the human Jesus is well worth while, but cannot be a halting point. If these people are only to discover the human Jesus, and to refuse to see the Christ, the situation will be pitiable indeed. If the present political aversion for the West constrains them to reject Western theology *in toto,* it will be unfortunate. The whole attitude indicated by these statements is not one in which men can rest. They will either go far beyond these nebulous notions of Christianity to its deeper essentials, or they will throw it all over and revert to inherited views of religion. It will not be enough to interest them in Jesus and gain a hearing. The leaders of religion in India and China will discover that, like Pilate of old, they must do something with Jesus. To secure their surrender to Him will continue to be the chief end and aim of missions. We will rejoice in the general interest shown, but we will not be deceived into thinking that nothing more is required.

The case of Mahatma Ghandi may illustrate what I seek to bring out. He has undoubtedly imbibed something of the spirit of Jesus. He knows the Bible fairly well. To a certain extent he has partaken of Christian ideals. He claims to have studied long and sought diligently for the secret of Christianity. In his address in the summer of 1925 to the Calcutta Missionary Conference he describes some of the efforts he put forth. He says he had approached Christianity prayerfully. After all this searching he declared he returned to the Bhagavad Gita and the Upanishads for spiritual satis-

faction. His statement is: "Today my position is that though I admire much in Christianity, I am unable to identify myself with orthodox Christianity. I must tell you in all humility that Hinduism, as I know it, entirely satisfies my soul, fills my whole being, and I find a solace in the Bhagavad Gita and Upanishads that I miss even in the Sermon on the Mount." (See *Young Men of India,* September, 1925.) Then he went on to criticize the missionaries very severely for not showing more receptivity, humility, and willingness to identify themselves with the Indian people.

I refer to Mr. Ghandi here not for purposes of general criticism, but to illustrate the point now under consideration. Here is a man who has been permeated with Christian idealism and remains definitely and avowedly a Hindu—Are we satisfied with his evangelization? Would we be satisfied to make all India like him as respects his relation to Christ and Christianity? Does the aim of merely penetrating Indian life with the idealism of Jesus seem adequate?

So we conclude that the mere "interpenetration" of the nations with the spirit of Jesus is not enough. So far as that idea hinders personal faith, personal surrender, and personal commitment to Jesus Christ, it is not to be desired. In its rejection of theological tenets and ecclesiastical organization of any kind, it is certainly not wise. Such a view can hardly be said to embody an essential aim in missions. At best, it is only one step toward our goal.

Aim No. 4: The Naturalization of Christianity in All Non-Christian Countries

In the last section it was argued that a mere acceptance of Christian idealism is not enough. It was

also suggested that certain dangers lurk in the conception of interpenetration taken alone as an aim of missions. We must now carry the aim one step further, and realize that it means the naturalization of Christianity in the non-Christian lands of the world.

For some years we have had reports to the effect that something like a new form or type of Christianity was arising in the Orient, more especially in India. Dr. Gilkey, who delivered the Barrows Lectures in India during 1925, professes to be deeply impressed by this fact. On the assumption that a new or different type of Christianity is actually developing in the Orient, are we to be alarmed over it? Is such a phenomenon to be regarded as discouraging or encouraging to all true supporters of missions? It is likely that the majority of our Western Christians will feel that there is real occasion for alarm in such a development. Our American churches do not take kindly to missionary addresses which emphasize the initiative and independence of the nationals. It does not hold out much hope for denominational extension or for control from America. But in spite of this, there is little occasion for alarm.

Perhaps it was natural for our lay people to suppose that a type of Christianity like our own would follow from our missionary labours. That our churches would be reproduced seemed a natural thing to expect. Yet today we are hearing that the nationals freely declare their dislike for much in our churches and in our whole type of Christianity.

The student of religious history is not dismayed at such reports. He knows that Christianity has taken many different forms in the course of its history in various countries. He is quite prepared to believe that

other new forms will yet arise. Virile peoples like the Indians and Chinese are very likely to create new forms of their own. He regards Christianity in its norm and essence as too dynamic a thing to receive a final form or even a complete interpretation among any one people. Moreover, he believes that the various forms do not mean a sacrifice as to its essentials, necessarily. He naturally regards efforts at new interpretations as interesting and as likely to yield some good results. He recognizes that each race has a genius of its own, and will approach truth in its own way. Such racial genius is likely to influence any reading of the original records of Christianity. So he rather rejoices in the initiative and independence shown by the national Christians of India or Japan. Is this not what we should have expected? Perhaps there is nothing in it to fear.

It has taken time and experience to teach our missionaries the large truth here indicated. As the years passed, they began to realize that our Western type of Christianity was not entirely convincing, but that Jesus Christ of the Gospels was entirely convincing. They became conscious that the Christianity they had raised up was quite foreign in type or form, and had its weaknesses among the Oriental folk. The importance of an indigenous Christianity grew upon them. Now it is a commonplace that only Christianity that is well naturalized can hope to win the hearts of the Eastern people, or arouse their enthusiasm. The strength and value of the indigenous cultures of these peoples has been brought home to us. Their splendid racial qualities are better understood. It was clear that these racial qualities and cultural inheritances would effect the interpretation of Christianity.

Such a course of events does not prove our Western Christianity false. It does not prove that the form it has taken in the West is not of extreme importance to them, as well as to us. The thinking of nineteen centuries in the West will not go for nothing. In the long run the East will borrow very much from the West. It will not be so easy to outstrip the West as many nationals seem to think at the present time. So far as we are concerned, we desire to place all our findings at their disposal, allowing them to take only what they want or can use. There is always the chance that our findings can be improved upon. They are not infallible, by any means. Yet we believe the Holy Spirit has been working in the Western Church, and in a long line of Western interpreters from St. Paul to Cadman. Nothing could be more foolish than to throw away the experience of all these years. On the other hand, we do mean that Christians in the Orient shall have complete liberty of interpretation. God reveals truth to each nation. There is yet much light to break from His Word. As Hindus and Chinese apply themselves to this task of interpretation, they will make discoveries which have escaped us. The danger on our side lies in supposing that our findings are final. We must remember that God is a God of diversity. When His full impact falls upon Indian Christians, the truth of the Gospel will be brought out in new glory and power. Let us not regard the diversity as evidence of degeneracy. Truth is one, but it has many faces. The new forms and illustrations of Oriental minds will help us all into some deeper and truer grasp of the truth as it is in Jesus Christ.

A brief historical resumé may help us just a little at this point. When one surveys the course of Christian

history and discovers how the various races and nations have contributed to our interpretation of Christianity, he can only rejoice in the prospect of further enrichment that is likely to follow from the effort of various peoples to interpret Christianity for themselves. History of Christian doctrine shows that the Greeks made a tremendous contribution to the creeds of the Church, and left a stamp upon them forever. Their intellectual vigour and ability to rationalize made it possible for them to give form to Christian thinking which was to prove of inestimable worth. They helped to construct our idea of God, the person and work of Christ, the trinity, and the Holy Spirit. Nor need we believe that this was all loss. Their work did not create confusion, nor yet complete secularization of the Gospel, as some would have us believe. The chances are that but for the work of Greek genius in rationalizing and explaining Christian ideas, those ideas would never have captured the world of the Roman Empire. The forms into which the Greek mind wrought our Christianity need not be regarded as inspired or infallible. A more cosmopolitan interpretation is quite possible. The essentials are too rich to be thus exhausted.

The contribution of Roman genius to Christianity is just as evident. In this case the contribution was not so much in the realm of doctrine, as in organization and life within the Church. In matters of law, polity, organization, and administration, the Roman mind excelled. They identified Christianity with the great ideals of law, government, justice. Yet in the doctrines of sin, retribution, and salvation, the Roman type of mind left a deep imprint upon the whole Christian system. The thinking of the Church for a thousand years followed the lines laid down. However, it is in

matters of organization and administration that the Roman mind had its most far-reaching influence upon our religion. The creation of the Roman Catholic Church was a typical result. The Church reproduced the empire in all its essentials of administration. No better illustration of the principle we seek to illustrate could be found than this one. Each people interprets Christianity through the medium of its own culture and racial ideals. Something like to national types result.

The same fact might be illustrated just as forcibly from the Germans, the Slavs, or Anglo-Saxons, or Americans. In each case there was a racial mind so strong as to be original, and as it came in contact with Christianity, it interpreted for itself. The total result has been a Christianity which is typical and characteristic of each people. Thus, the sum total of interpretation has been vastly enriched, and our understanding of Christianity has been enlarged. Moreover, it need not be inferred, necessarily, that the essence of Christianity has been lost in either case. To some extent all have erred in their reading of Christianity. To a large degree there is agreement, and we must conclude that all contain a large measure of truth.

Is it not apparent that what other peoples have done for Christianity in the past, and what some are doing now, that the great races of the Orient will do in the future? These peoples are destined to add their own interpretation and understanding of Christianity to that of the Western peoples. We must regard this expectation optimistically. There is no occasion for alarm. Even if there were danger, the thing will yet happen. It simply cannot be otherwise. But our faith is that Christianity in its norm is so vital, so rich a thing, that it will never be exhausted by even all the

peoples. The full understanding can never be realized by any one people. The pristine fact is so tremendously dynamic that it cannot be humanly utilized or expressed fully. The fact will be clothed in accordance with the genius of each nation. But no creed or liturgy can completely embody the fact itself. All creeds will be but broken lights of the original light. Man can no more fully embody the mystery we have in Jesus Christ than men can completely absorb the sun. Each nation or race may draw freely upon it, but the dynamic centre will not be lessened. It is highly desirable, therefore, that complete freedom be accorded everywhere. The nationals in each land must be encouraged to go forward in their interpretation of this sublime mystery.

"Let knowledge grow from more to more,
And more of reverence with us dwell."

The position here taken is that not only is such a course inevitable, but it is also desirable. If Christianity is ever to be a dynamic thing in any one of these countries, it will be when it has been fully naturalized and adapted to the mind and genius of that people. An indigenous Christianity and an indigenous Church are absolutely essential.

The nationals complain not a little that we offer them a Christ who is a Westerner; that we present Christ in Western garb, and that they cannot feel drawn to such a Christ. There is no small difficulty at this point. The difficulty is more acute today because of the strong nationalistic feelings that exist in nearly all mission lands. This difficulty was sensed many years ago by the best minds in the Orient. Babu P. C. Mozoomdar, of Calcutta, India, wrote many years ago his notable book on the Oriental Christ. He stressed

the fact that Jesus was an Asiatic, and that He was hidden for the Asiatic, by the trappings of European theology and Church. He argued that Jesus must be freed from these Western graveclothes, and when that was done, that Asia will turn to Him. That there is a goodly measure of truth in this contention we must concede. Since missionaries were Westerners and could only carry what they had learned, a real difficulty has been created. But there is a way out of this difficulty. Christianity must be allowed to become indigenous; it must be naturalized. We must expect the Oriental mind to orientalize Christianity. Nor should this be a difficult task, nor yet despoil Christianity, which came out of Asia.

How important this matter is may be seen from such statements as follow from the pens of well known Japanese Christian leaders of nearly a generation ago. These quotations give the point of view and feeling of thousands of Christians in all parts of the Orient today.

" The future Christianity of Japan will be no importation," says the Rev. Matsumura Kaiseki, " however good, but will be the product of Japanese minds, on Japanese soil, conformed to the conditions of life in this country. When Christianity came to the Greek and Roman peoples, it found them dissatisfied with their own religions, and seeking for one that was better. The universal nature of Christianity and its practical character caused it to take deep root in these nations. In doing so, it assimilated what was good in Greek and Roman thought and customs. Christianity has certain unchanging principles, but it ever changes its form. Even Paul differed from James, and Jewish Christianity was not wholly like that accepted by the Gentiles. Now Christianity comes to Japan. But it comes as a

series of sects: Presbyterians, Methodists, and Episcopalians. Our true policy forbids our acceptance of these sects, for they are the results of conditions which have existed in other lands. It is true that Unitarians are trying to adapt Christianity to present conditions, but this has so far been the work of foreigners, and is not what we want. If now we try to forecast the future of Christianity, we must realize first of all that Christianity will be largely modified by Buddhistic and Confucian ideas. Just as Christianity absorbed the Greek philosophy when it entered Greece, so it must absorb the best Japanese thought as it enters Japan. It is further evident that the coming Christianity must adapt itself to various classes of people, and be as varied as human life itself. For men of the lower classes there must be practical teaching, and such people must be moved by appeals to faith and the emotions. Toward the highly developed people Christianity must express itself in socialistic ways, propagating great moral ideals, edifying the peoples, and raising up benefactors of society. Lastly, for the benefit of the most thoughtful, there must be an ideal of Christianity which deals with the greatest questions of thought and life and ever tends toward the highest mysticism. May the day speedily come when such a national Christianity shall be realized."

The above was written about thirty years ago and represented the outlook of far-seeing men then, and still represents the viewpoint of the strongest leaders of the Church in the Orient. At about the same period another Japanese minister, who achieved great results for the cause and was recognized widely as a sane and conscientious leader, said the following: "Christianity changes; it absorbs ideas and customs; but as it

changes by absorption, it gives new life to that which it appropriates. It is still Christianity in spite of these changes. See how Origen differed from Augustine, Tauler from Calvin, Wesley from Edwards. Yet all were Christians. We need to distinguish between the permanent elements and the transient accretions of our faith. Foolish people think they can make up a new religion by combining the best elements of many faiths. As well try to make a living body by bringing together component parts from different places. A religion is not the product of thought, but a growth, a thing of life. (And experience.) Finally the future Christianity must be founded on Christ. That will make it practical, concrete. Righteousness, strong faith, salvation, these are the only words until they are realized in a strong personality. Some oppose Christ as they suppose, but it is always some theory of Christ they oppose, not Christ Himself. With this great character as the centre, the Christianity of the future will be such as will satisfy the whole man, his thought, his feeling, and his will, and all our present sects will perhaps make contribution toward this large and inclusive faith."

The bearing of all this upon the importance of naturalizing Christianity in the Orient must not be missed. One who has moved among the Christian churches of the Orient and has heard the congregations sing Western hymns, repeat Western-made creeds, use Western forms of worship, and use Western modes of thought, has realized how unreal and incongruous it all was. Everything was unnatural and largely unreal to them. The same traveller may have chanced sometimes to worship with a congregation where everything was done in the manner of the peo-

ple, and where everything was naturalized, and if so, he cannot forget the satisfaction there was in such a service. Plainly, Christianity can never be a real power among any people until it is thus adapted.

Now such adaptation cannot be achieved by the foreign missionary. No matter how much he tries, or how thoroughly he is in sympathy with the principle involved, or how long he has been in the country, he can never accomplish this end for them. It is something the native churches must accomplish for themselves. The missionary can sow fundamental ideas and let them spring up and nurture them as best he can until they take root in the soil and become acclimated. The peculiar form they take will depend not upon him, but upon the genius of the people among whom he works. The adaptation must be accomplished by the nationals themselves. This process of adaptation and naturalization is going on rapidly in all the forward fields today. Let us hope that with this accomplished, the faith will be a thing of power to them, as it has been to us. No doubt there are dangers attending this process, and the wise missionary will see his opportunity for guidance and counsel of the native Church. But the process itself he cannot stop.

All of this has much to do with our aim in missions. To recognize the fact here disclosed will save us from much undue concern, and waste of effort to create a Church like our own Western Church in every particular. Since there is not the slightest chance of developing any institution after our type and on our mould, what shall our direct objective be? We have already suggested that the fundamental thing we seek to accomplish is to impart a spirit, and develop a character after the pattern of Jesus Christ. We shall hope to

raise up companies of people who will thus share with us the spirit and character of Christ, and having accomplished that end, be satisfied to let the development take the natural course in view of the culture and racial qualities of the people. So far as we make it our aim to transplant a particular creed or type of organization or form of worship or form of art or architecture or clothes or language, we will have disappointment. Unless we follow the methods of the Roman Church and insist upon uniformity in such matters, we must expect variety in all these matters.

We are now coming to see that the task before us is the planting of the seed of the Gospel in the soil of these lands. We must expect the plant to become finally indigenous to the soil. So long as it is exotic, it will be a weak and sickly affair. Our expectation is that the plant will become associated with the climate and soil in such a way as to make hardy growth. In other words, the ideas of Christianity must be deposited in the mental and spiritual soil of India and China, and become thus thoroughly acclimated. Our faith is that when this plant is thus transplanted and becomes part and parcel of the soil of these lands, there will be an exuberant growth. We must not forget that time is required for this process. It cannot be accomplished in a day. Any rapid acceptance of these ideas will be in the nature of mere imitation. This is what has happened in too many cases so far in our movement. But the Gospel cannot be fitted to these people as a tailor fits a suit of clothes. It must be growth, and this will take many days in most countries. In the Roman Empire there could be a rapid acceptance of Christianity, and a rapid realization of its ideas, because of the common stock of ideas to begin with. The work of Paul

was more nearly home missionary work, than foreign. He was never beyond a common language and a common civilization and a common stock of ideas.

In the Orient today there is nowhere that commonality of language, civilization, or culture which Paul found. For this reason the process must of necessity be slower. The task of orientating Christianity is far more difficult. Nevertheless, it can be accomplished, yea to some extent it is now accomplished. It will now be realized on an accelerated scale in the years ahead.

It has been apparent that the Christianity of India and China was too foreign in its form and accent to grip these peoples strongly. Our missionary churches seemed to be foreign institutions. This foreign cast has been their weakness and had stood in the way of larger success. All of this has been greatly accentuated by the growth of strong national feelings. Now with the national consciousness aroused, it is certain that no foreignized church or Christianity can win the people. No one doubts the necessity of naturalizing the movement. How this demand effects leadership and various other matters we shall leave to other writers on the problems of the indigenous Church. All agree that control must now be passed to the nationals as quickly as possible, always having regard to their fitness for such leadership. So the process of devolution goes on rapidly under the pressure of national feeling against everything foreign and Western. We may regret that we are being driven faster than is wise to go, but the whole programme is in harmony with our essential aims. Our wisest missionaries have taken a stand on this principle long before it became acute as it is today. They have stood for the largest possible measure of liberty for the nationals in interpretation

and leadership. They saw the importance of removing the foreign ear-marks as soon as possible. They have long since encouraged the full naturalization of Christianity. They are thoroughly convinced that only a dynamic Christianity can win any of the nations, and a dynamic Christianity must be a naturalized Christianity.

We face a situation today much like that of St. Paul in at least one particular. He found that the old Jewish moulds (Jewish type) made a universal and conquering Christianity impossible. Before the faith could conquer the empire, it had to be freed from such limitations as Judaism placed upon it. It could not burst forth into a free, strong, and unfettered life while dependent upon those Jewish forms. Just as Christianity had to be cut loose from Judaism in that age, so in some smaller measure it must be cut loose from Western forms and usages before it can attain its fullest life in the Orient. So far as Western forms are an incubus upon it, they must be left behind. The faith must now take such forms and expression as may be natural for the people of the Orient, forms in harmony with their racial and national genius. The wine of the Gospel cannot there be contained in the old wine-skins.

Aim No. 5: A World Dominated by Christian Standards of Life

Our aim in missions includes the idea of a Christianized world. Under the head of evangelization above, it was affirmed that we are not satisfied merely to make inquirers, or to make converts; nor to baptize men and receive them into the Church, but that our aim was to continue our efforts until men actually lived the Gospel in its entirety. Today we dream of a Christianized

world, a world dominated by Christian ideals of life. Nothing less than this can be our aim in missions, as in everything we do in religion.

We have also affirmed above that the missionary endeavour must be a perpetual aspect of the life of the Church of Christ. The missionary impulse, being fundamentally spiritual and always springing up in the hearts of truly spiritual men, there can be no end to the missionary enterprise. Since we are missionary because of something done in us, a glorious experience of redeeming love in Christ, and not chiefly because of the call of the world, it follows that in some form missionary effort is perpetual in the Church.

It is reasonable to believe that we shall never get to a point where missionary effort would not be called for. The deep inward and spiritual impulse will remain, and so far as we can see, there will always be persons who need to be evangelized. For one thing, each new generation in our own land must be evangelized. There will be spiritual needs to be met at home and abroad. We must, therefore, entirely rid ourselves of the idea that missionary work is a passing phase of the life of the Church. We must frown on any campaign or propaganda which rests upon any such supposition.

In this section it is desirable that we emphasize the fact that missions will not be complete until human society is transformed and Christianized. This provides us with a limitless task. Anything short of this goal will not satisfy us. The great commission passage contemplates the "teaching of men to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you," and as we have seen implies the Christianization of the world, and not a mere preachment.

From this standpoint there has been a vast change

in our aim. Originally we thought in terms of individual converts, not in terms of society. We planned to pick a few souls from the burning, but not to put out the fire. The emphasis on the social Gospel has transformed our missionary plans. Canon Freemantle taught us to think of the world as a subject of redemption. Hence we want the whole world brought under the power of Christ. Religion is to touch the whole of human life. It is to touch the whole of society. Individuals will be sought out, but our task reaches out beyond the individual, to the sum total of his relations as a member of society. We are thinking in terms of the Kingdom of God. The Gospel of the Kingdom is a social Gospel, as well as a Gospel for the individual. The Gospel has significance for the family, business, commerce, politics, diplomacy, international relations, and all that concerns human life.

It is now becoming apparent that the Kingdom of God cannot come in one land until it comes in all lands, for we are all members one of another. No one section of the world can be saved fully from the evils that afflict it until all others are saved with it. We must make the Gospel a power in all lands before it can be a triumphant thing in any one land. The great social, industrial, and political evils which afflict the world are international in scope and must be solved on an international scale. No one of our American problems can be solved satisfactorily except as it is solved in other lands. The idea that we might concentrate our forces upon one land and really work out a solution of these problems, and thus point the way for others, is attractive, but unsound. The evils of society must be attacked in all lands by setting up the opposing principles of religion at the same time. The industrial problem

is today an international problem and is very similar in essentials in Europe, America, Japan, and India. The opium and narcotic trade is an international affair and cannot be successfully dealt with in any country alone. We may come to see that the prohibition of the liquor traffic is virtually impossible in one land so long as it is legal in other lands. This is not an argument why a people should not oppose the traffic in every way it can, nor is it against prohibition as a policy, but it is recognition of the fact that our success must be relative until other nations join us in putting this traffic under the ban of law. The war problem cannot be solved by any one nation working alone. It must be solved by the co-operation of many peoples. No one nation can remain unarmed, and no nation can disarm while the other nations are armed. Groups of people may turn pacifist, but that will not help the situation practically, beyond possibly calling attention to the evil of war as such. It is in the field of health and sanitation that we realize our relationship to each other best. The health of every nation is imperiled so long as contagions go unchecked in any one land. Health is a world problem and must be dealt with as a world problem. In all these matters, we are deeply and truly members one of another. We cannot escape the fact that we are tied up together.

It is apparent that missions are definitely related to each and all of these problems. Their solution must be considered a part of our programme and aim. It is important to state that missions have already been extremely influential in connection with all these world problems. The efforts to reduce these giant evils have not been without fruitage. The efforts of missionaries to stop the flagrant evils in non-Christian lands, as

well as those that emanate from Western lands, are well known, and are a great credit to them. In regard to caste, foot-binding, opium, liquor, tobacco, and other hurtful superstitions and practices, they have long been leaders of reform. In some instances, these evils are national only and may be stopped. But generally the great evils are international and require a wider treatment.

It is evident that those well-meaning people who now propose that we stop foreign missions until we make America Christian are very short-sighted, and their policy is utterly mistaken. America can only become Christian in a true sense as her neighbours also become Christian. The Christian leaven must be put to work in all lands. There must be thorough co-operation in all lands between all the forces of good against the co-operating forces of evil. If the good leaven becomes active all around the world definite and lasting results will be secured. In the long run we must morally all go up or down together. In any case it will be impossible to make any one spot wholly Christian. Even if it could be achieved, it would only be temporary in effect. The evil from outside would overflow the cleansed territory and contaminate it again.

Much has been said about Christianizing the impact of the West upon the East. Nothing could be more desired than that, but we must believe far more in a social Gospel than we do before much will be done. We now have an awakened East. It is tremendously aroused over the sins of the West. Strong anti-Western tendencies are evident. They just begin to realize how deeply they have been wronged at the hands of the strong Western peoples. Their indignation is now stirred. That missionaries are included in

the anti-foreign agitation is quite natural. However, the missionaries have done but little to warrant such a conclusion. The Chinese must shortly begin to discriminate between missionaries with their unselfish policy of service, and the traders and diplomats who have too often had only selfish aims. But leaving that issue aside, nothing is more to be desired than that the Western powers might be induced to deal with China and other nations on a basis of true friendship, something like a Christian basis. Such a course of generous action on their part now would atone for much of the past and stop the rise of that indignation which is so apparent on all sides at present. On the whole, it must be conceded that missions are a constructive influence in the Far East today. How large a part missions are taking in leading on toward a new and better internationalism cannot be told here. However, none conversant with the situation can doubt the value of missions in relation to international matters, and especially in connection with the problem of trying to Christianize the contacts of West with East.

It is essential for all to recognize that these are proper ends of missionary work. Our missionary enterprise still has a gracious ministry to perform in these connections, and we must not thwart such efforts by decrying them as outside the missionary aim. We must use all legitimate influence to improve relations between the nations. Our efforts here may more properly be directed in the first instance toward assisting our own Government to take such a Christian course.

This is only an illustration of the countless ways in which Christian missions may encourage Christian standards of life around the world. Again, let it be said that we will not be satisfied to secure individual

conversions only. That is significant, and we will bend all our energies to do that, but we shall not stop there. To help that convert Christianize all his daily contacts with his brothers in society will be a matter of constant concern to us. We will remember that the Gospel is one, but has two phases, the personal and the social. The latter is as legitimate as the first. Let us proclaim on all sides that the missionary enterprise is out for a Christian world. We are interested that men may as rapidly as possible hear the word of life. In a word, we are concerned about the preachment of the Gospel. But we confess if that were not to be followed up with particular teaching and training until men learn to live the Gospel, we should consider it of minor importance. We therefore favour institutions. Schools are essential to such a missionary programme. Hospitals are essential to such a programme. Agricultural missions are a part of such a programme. Churches are essential to such a continued programme. Social settlements and institutional churches are essential to such a programme of missions. All these are necessary if we are to really Christianize the world.

I may bring this section to a close by quoting some words from Professor E. C. Moore, of Harvard University, in his volume entitled *West and East,* where he says: "The fruit of true evangelization must always be Christianization. The Christianization of men and races which have already come into contact with the Gospel through the movement which we are trying to describe will be a problem for Christendom, and far more, for the races themselves, for generations yet to come. Even if we reckon with accelerated pace at which, in all aspects of its life, our world is moving, we must see it so. One means of hastening the work

we have to do is a clear view and patient spirit as to our task. That task is the quickening of the world to its own best life through the spirit of Christianity. It is the interpretation of Christianity by that life. It is the fulfilment of all that is human through that which we believe to be the farthest reach which man has made toward God, and the clearest revelation which God has vouchsafed in answer to the cry of man. When we feel in profound contrition, as we must at this moment, how far Christianity is from being Christianized, we realize how great is the task which lies before us if we would Christianize the world." (See *West and East,* pp. 93-94.)

Aim No. 6: An International Christianity

Today we are reaching out toward a new aim or goal in missions. The conviction that in its present form and with its present methods, an epoch is coming to a close, is upon many. But the conviction is also present that our missionary task is not a passing one. It will go on indefinitely after the present phases have passed. We begin to perceive dimly that we are to help one another as bodies of Christian believers. One reason why the churches in some quarters of the world are impoverished is that they lived their lives in isolation from the rest of the churches. God's plan is that believers may be enriched by sharing all they experience with others and receiving from others the fruit of their experience.

Hence we now visualize an international Christianity. The age of national religions is passing. Either religions must be international or pass away. The goal tomorrow will be a living, connected, helping, international Christianity. This ideal must not be confused

with an international church like Methodism or Romanism or Presbyterianism. Such denominational aspirations may be directly opposed to the ideal we here have in mind. Our task tomorrow will be to relate all believers to all other believers. For some time this cannot mean amalgamation into one world-wide church. It must mean a federation of all believers into as close relationships as possible. Christians in any one land must become conscious of Christians in every other land. There will be common tasks on which to unite. There must be a complete sharing of all that the Holy Spirit has taught any one section of the Church with every other section of the Church. The propagation of Christianity in parts where it is not planted will be the task of all alike, whether Indians, Chinese, Americans, or Germans. There will also be a complete taking from every section of the Church, each body both giving and receiving constantly. Through this process a maximum of life and vitality will be realized. The largest and richest interpretations of the norm of Christianity will thus be secured, and Christ shall become all and in all, in all the churches. It is through such an international Christianity that we shall do away with the " stigma of foreign missions." There will be no superior groups anywhere. There will be no section handing down something to inferiors below. There will be no more heathen. There will be a recognition of equality and the right of every section or nation to a full control of its churches, but also the duty of uniting with all other Christians for the enrichment of the whole body of believers in every land. Such an aim in missions will save us from the narrowing and partisan ideals that obtain in some sections. The cry against " foreign

missions" will not be raised. Missions will be no longer the concern of favoured groups, but the concern of all.

Such an international Christianity will call forth some kind of organization. The object of such organization will be to provide the best ways and means of keeping Christians in vital touch with one another. It will have to be very simple and flexible at first. The full freedom of none can be abridged. The freedom of local control and local action will be recognized. Yet there will be bonds of fellowship and co-operation in tasks that will be real and helpful.

The issue of national or international churches is naturally raised. Without attempting a full discussion of the problem, we may try to indicate some of the factors involved.

The term, indigenous church, has two connotations: First, such a church is to be a naturalized institution, a natural growth in some particular country. In another sense, it implies a national church. Plainly, if churches are to be so fully naturalized in any given country, they will be national institutions. All agree that the churches raised up in non-Christian lands must be indigenous, *i. e.*, adapted to the soil, but we have not considered that it is pretty certain to follow that they will be national in scope, rather than international. The stress placed on an indigenous church has naturally implied a national church. The latter consideration has often been lost sight of in our appeals for a naturalized church. It may be said that a church might be indigenous in every true sense and still be international in outlook and interest. This is plainly possible, but not probable.

Some religious leaders would accomplish in the

Church what has been accomplished by the British Empire. The ideal of binding a lot of races together under one Government is attractive and certainly has values. But the experience of the British goes far to prove that only a commonwealth of nations, and not an old-fashioned empire, can exist in our modern world. It is possible for a group of peoples to hold together under one sovereign head, but only when practically complete autonomy to each race is guaranteed. On any other basis, the British peoples could not hold together. It is apparent that the problem of the international church is very similar. Practically, it is the problem of toning down the rabid nationalism of any particular people so that co-operation is possible. Moreover, this is the problem facing the League of Nations. How can the local and national interests be adjusted to the larger international needs? Until the nationalistic spirit in countries like Italy, France, Turkey, and the United States can be tempered, any association of states will be exceedingly difficult. But this is the situation also with reference to a world-church. The national church is created by the patriotism of a given people. Until something more can be done through education to modify local patriotism, an international church will be difficult, if not utterly impossible.

With a developing international mind throughout the world, it is natural that the idea of international churches should arise. However, such a consummation does not imply an international organization such as the Roman Catholic Church is today, with power centralized, and an autocratic control from that centre, but rather a group of free churches working together in a world fellowship to solve the problems common to all.

It is apparent that many of our leaders have not yet thought through the implications of an international church. As a matter of fact, we have not yet considered with any care what may be the difference between national or international churches. In a general way, all of us believe an international church is desirable. Such a church, if genuinely international in spirit, would be more in harmony with the spirit of Jesus and the Gospel we preach. But the kind of an international church we see in Rome will not do. Rome lacks nearly every essential quality of a truly international church except geographical extension. Methodism has little semblance of a world-church except geographical extension. In both cases, the power of control has been at the centre and is not distributed. The first is an imperialism of a kind that the world is not going to endure much longer. There is no recognition of democracy or equality of races. There is no working together as equal partners. The democratic principle has not yet been appropriated by Rome, nor to any great extent in Methodism. Self-determination of peoples has not been accepted, except by a very few. The idea of superiority is strong. The notion of Nordic supremacy is yet powerful in our Western churches. Half our people believe in it.

However, the difference between national and international churches is, after all, not so great or real as sometimes supposed. Any international church today must be made up of a group of peoples living under vastly different conditions and requiring very different standards, rules, and regulations in the church. No book of rules applicable to all can be written. Each group or race will have to formulate its own regulations for the most part. In a word, an international

church is possible only when complete autonomy is extended to each racial group. This means vast variety in one organization. It really amounts to a number of churches agreeing to hold together on a few fundamental points and agreeing to differ on a great many other points. No other kind of international church is possible at this stage of our development. The principle of freedom and self-determination must be fully recognized. If, as Christians, we really want to develop an international church, we must be prepared for vast variety in one body and the formulation of doctrinal and governmental standards quite different from our own here in the United States. Unless we are prepared for this contingency, we should stop all talk about an international church.

Now it is apparent that if national churches develop, a similar situation will exist. Each racial group will have its own church and be supreme in it. No domination or control from without will obtain. On the other hand, each national group or church will be affiliated closely with other national groups, and there will be federation and a working-together on the main issues of the Kingdom. It is apparent that the real facts are similar in both situations, and in the end it will not really matter much whether we have national or international churches.

If people of many races could really sink all their differences, see eye to eye in all practical and doctrinal matters, lose the extreme sense of nationalism, and become citizens of the world, then an ideal international church would be possible and desirable. But while the present differences obtain, we must agree on a world-church which is a compromise. It must be a church composed of various units, entirely free and self-

determining, and differing in many respecst from every other group, but still holding together in a sort of League of Nations, which can make no rules or laws for an individual group, but which may be a symbol of our desire for unity and of the few fundamentals we hold in common, and offer an opportunity for exchanging opinions, experiences, and viewpoints, and an expression of common ideals toward which we may strive.

Up to the present time, the national church has developed in all lands, and is most likely to develop further in spite of any efforts we put forth. We took to the ideal of a national church in the U. S. A. very early in our history. Methodism and the Episcopal Church soon threw off the control from Great Britain. Nationalism is even more rampant today than then. It is also rampant throughout the Orient. It is likely that most Christians will associate themselves with national organizations. Nor can they be censured for doing so.

IV

THE UNIQUENESS OF CHRISTIANITY

IT is clear that the missionary enterprise has built upon the supposition that Christianity was not one of the religions of the world, but was in some sense the religion of the world. So long as this claim passed either unnoticed or unchallenged, our movement rested on a secure foundation. Today we find that claim challenged on every side with increasing fervour. How does the situation stand now in view of the concessions we make about other religions? Are we compelled to admit the claim of our opponents, or is there still good ground for our claim that in Christianity there is uniqueness and superiority? We propose here a very brief account of this situation as a fitting close of our whole discussion of missionary essentials. We cannot pretend here to offer an adequate discussion of this difficult and exceedingly important theme. For those interested we can only refer to the authorities who have given special attention to this problem.

For the missionary this question of uniqueness is of supreme importance. It cannot be avoided. The future of Christianity, and of missions, is tied up in this issue. Mr. J. H. Oldham is right when he declares that the nerve of missionary endeavour is the conviction that in the Christian revelation there is something distinctive and vital which the world cannot do without. The question whether in that revelation of God in Christ we possess a treasure of incomparable worth

is the critical issue on which the whole enterprise rests. If we believed other systems of religion can do what man needs done for his full salvation, we would certainly lose the sense of obligation and urgency in missions. We might continue a desultory effort, but the deep conviction which has characterized missionaries would probably no longer be present. We have believed in the ability of Christianity to do for men all that needs to be done in order to live the largest and richest life. But we have also believed that Christ alone can do what needs to be done. Without denying the value of other systems, and their worth to the people who profess them, we have held that they cannot discover God in all His fulness through those systems alone, but that such a discovery can be made in Jesus Christ. The finality we have believed in was simply this: "That God in Christ is able to do the utmost that man needs for the fulfilment of his true nature, the attainment of eternal life, the possession of the supreme good." (See *Final Faith,* by W. D. MacKenzie.) The other side of this claim was that in no other name could man find that uttermost salvation. Must we now recede from this position?

Considerable may be said for the originality of the Christian message in general. So much has been said about duplicating every statement of the Gospels in other Scriptures, that perhaps we do not realize what a gap really exists between the message of the New Testament and that of other Scriptures. Dr. MacIntosh, in his book *The Originality of the Christian Message,* has given us a careful and conservative statement of the situation. He declares that "Christianity is in no sense a reproduction, or a revision of older faiths." This conclusion can be maintained. It did not borrow

its chief contents from other systems of China, India, or Egypt. It did take over the Hebrew Old Testament. It was only incidentally influenced by the other systems, either the religions of Babylonia or Egypt. That Christianity has a distinct and original message and exhibits a remarkable religious inspiration and genius can hardly be questioned.

If the field be now limited to the teachings of Jesus, we must admit that there we have a very original spirit and outlook, and His utterances surely betoken a large measure of originality. The vigour and originality of His mind is scarcely questioned. He did, of course, build upon the ideas of the Hebrew prophets, but when these ideas were taken over, they were filled with a new content and value. They were really transformed as they passed through His mind. He fills them not only with new content, but with a new spirit. The old ideas appear in new combinations and are fused with His own spirit and personality. The attempt to parallel every one of His utterances from the Sacred Books of other peoples shows some striking similarities in the letter. Yet when their content and spirit are considered, there is usually a good distance between Him and His competitors. When assembled and worked into doctrines we undoubtedly have a valuable contribution to the world's religious thinking. We may now consider a few of His outstanding ideas.

The distinctive ideas of Jesus are those that concern God, Himself, and the divine Spirit He proposed to give to men. It has come to be pretty generally recognized that Jesus' idea of God is the only one the modern world can receive. That this idea of God possesses a large measure of originality must be affirmed. A careful comparison of His idea with the idea of God in

the various systems, its beauty, power, and attractiveness becomes fairly evident. His intense emphasis upon Fatherhood in God was a new emphasis, though not a new idea. But Jesus made Fatherhood in God possess a meaning and value it never has had in any other system. In insisting that God was like Himself, and that He was like God, Jesus was strikingly, and almost offensively, original. Perhaps the most signal contribution of the New Testament to the idea of God is this concreteness the idea received at the hands of Jesus. That we preach a Christ-like God is our greatest glory. But Jesus' complete moralization of God, and His constant association of God with righteousness, while not original in idea, is original in its intensity, and in its constancy. Then the way in which he associates God with those tender qualities of sympathy, compassion, and love, is surely arresting. Above all else, His idea of God is original in that God is One who goes forth seeking the sinning soul, and seeking by every agency to bring it back to Himself and to peace. We have referred to this conception above in speaking of the missionary motive, and there called it a unique conception of God. We believe it is. It is doubtful whether in any of the Scriptures there is such a picture of the Divine. All religions have much to say about what man must do to find God, but that God goes and finds man is not so common. When all is said, do we not here have an idea of God that may well be said to be unique? Some of these aspects may be found in other systems, but not all of them together, and not in the same fulness as in the Gospels. The Eternal Father God of Jesus is the noblest conception of the Divine that has reached our human minds.

Professor R. E. Hume sums up his research in this

field as follows: "World-wide comparison shows that the very simple analogy for God as being a 'Father' has been used among the non-Christian religions only with a very limited application or with a limited content. The noble moral idea that God is a loving, spiritual Father of all mankind has been recorded nowhere among sacred Scriptures except in Christianity." This statement has much more force than here appears, inasmuch as the writer had noted the various references in the various Scriptures to the word "father" as applied to God. He goes on to say: "The New Testament is the only document among the canonical Scriptures of the world which teaches that the supreme Deity is a universal heavenly Father. One essential and unique feature of Chrsitianity is the teaching that God is the wise, holy, serviceable Sovereign of the whole world, who in His love and righteousness experiences suffering for the sins of His human children, and who patiently and successfully is helping to redeem men from their sins into the likeness of His own perfect character." (See *World's Living Religion,* pp. 273-274.)

We have asserted that the uniqueness of Christianity is found in the person and character of Jesus Christ. One looks in vain for another person in history which can compare with Him. We may first of all remind the reader of the distinctive self-consciousness of Jesus. It may be taken for granted that in no Scripture will one find the portrait of one with His consciousness of sinlessness. In no other literature do we read of one who could even challenge his enemies to point in what particular he had sinned. No sense of moral turpitude ever crept across His soul. In this regard He is lifted out of all human categories. This writer is not aware

that in other Scriptures do we have even a pretence to sinlessness on the part of the great founders, or leaders of the religions. Gautoma Buddha, Confucius, and Mohammed never asserted such a claim. They were admittedly sinners, and in need of redemption. Each of them sought to find redemption in their own ways. Mohammed never pretended to special sanctity. What is true of them is true of all others whose lives we have access to, except Jesus. Now this claim may be passed over as of no significance, but the Gospels make a special point of it, and indicate the utter surprise of His contemporaries at the claim.

It is true, however, that the claim of Jesus to be a leader and teacher of mankind does not rest on this unique element of His character. Whether He was the absolutely perfect man in flesh or not, He was so manifestly above other men that He is always in a class by Himself. There is a perfection and beauty about Him as He walks the highways of Palestine that men will always draw toward Him as steel to a magnet. He stands out in history as the one capable of pointing the way of life and salvation. It is not a part of our present task to draw a complete portrait of Him, but to assert the everlasting superiority He shows over all other men. Professor Hume sums up the situation and concludes: " Jesus Christ alone is reported as having had a consistent God-consciousness, a consistent character Himself, and a consistent programme for His religion. The most remarkable and valuable aspect of the personality of Jesus Christ is the comprehensiveness and universal availability of His character, as well as its own loftiness, consistency, and sinlessness." " He is unique, yet the exemplary, combination of being clearly a son of man and also pre-eminently the Son

of God. He grew in the flesh, yet He participated consciously in the Eternal, and He has made the superlative manifestation of God to the world. . . . He is unequalled by any other who has lived upon earth, yet He possesses the qualities of personality which all persons should possess" (*Ibid.*, p. 275). That such a life was original is too apparent to doubt. Christians need have no fear that a better than He will ever arise.

It is now opportune to point out that there is a unique element in the Christian idea of salvation. One of the outstanding effects of Jesus' life of purity is to convict men of impurity, of sin. That the Christian message has a strange power of developing a genuine consciousness of personal sinfulness seems most desirable if men are to be really changed. That any other system does this so successfully as Christianity may well be questioned. Then there is a uniqueness in the way Christ drove at what He called sin in men, as against ideas of fate, or karma. In Islam, salvation is to overcome a man's evil kismet, and in Hinduism it is to overcome the law of karma, to break the karmic chain. In neither case is there a distinct recognition of a man's personal part in his sinfulness. In Christ, salvation is from actual sinfulness and the guilt that accompanies actual sinfulness. There is no slurring over the idea of personal sinfulness where the Gospel of Christ is preached in its purity. It seems to us that in other systems there is no proper recognition of a man's part in his evil estate, and too much emphasis has been placed upon what is best termed fate. Man seems to be in the grip of nature. He is really helpless to help himself, even so much as turning to God. Jesus seems to believe that a man could always find his way back to the divine if he turned his heart toward God.

In contrast with various systems of salvation, the view of Christ is distinctive in that it is more than ceremonial salvation. The deliverance is to be actual, and will be exhibited in new moral vigour, in a new will to seek after righteousness for its own sake. Jesus taught a new birth in the Spirit, which in its essentials may be said to be a unique idea in religion. At any rate, in the larger place Jesus gave it, and the emphasis He laid upon it, it was unique. The others talk, too, of conversion. The Buddhist talks of enlightenment, but there is nothing like the immediacy or certitude of accomplishment as that indicated in the words of Jesus Christ.

There is also something unique in the idea of the Divine Spirit as working in human life and furnishing the much-needed dynamic of power. The notion that God is a Spirit, and that as Spirit He is always searching man out, and seeking to impart His own wonderful life to him, is surely not common in the religions. We understand only too well how fine teaching may never accomplish much in the way of results. Ideals are fine as far as they go. But the realization of ideals is our problem. Jesus is here unique. Even if we allowed the equality of ideals and teachings in other systems Jesus would still have the pre-eminence, because He alone seems to make definite provision for a spirit of power to enable us to carry the teaching into life. How this element stands out in Christianity may be seen from another quotation from Professor Hume. " Christianity is the only religion which teaches as a doctrine of great practical as well as scriptural importance that there is at work in the world a divine universal Holy Spirit, indwelling, teaching, suggesting, reprimanding, inspiring, transforming, available for every individual

who will open his heart to this divine influence. Jesus, Himself, taught what every true Christian experiences: that there is a powerful divine active agency in the world, seeking to apply the priniples of Jesus, and leading on to a fuller appreciation of truth." Dr. Hume regards the idea of the Holy Spirit as having no real counterpart in the other religions. It would seem that he has strong ground for such a statement.

In one other respect it seems fairly certain that Jesus has a place of pre-eminence, namely, in associating religion and morality so closely as he does. We have indicated above that His salvation is no ceremonial or symbolical affair. He sought a new birth in the Spirit. He wanted a man created anew in righteousness. It is now in order to emphasize the fact that He not only provided a high ethical standard, but also the dynamic to realize it. Further, He alone seems to identify religion with a highly moral life. It is a noteworthy fact that in most of the religions of the Eastern people there is little relation between religion and morality. The world is rapidly coming to believe that the essential thing to human welfare is a sound morality. It has no patience with religion that does not relate itself to the highest standards of morality known. It is mere folly to claim a high degree of spirituality for a man who is a moral pervert, judged by the accepted standards of morality. In many instances those most revered as religious examples are moral degenerates. So far as this is true of other faiths, it must be a fatal weakness. So far as Christianity holds up high principles of morality and insists upon its devotees reaching up to these high moral principles, it must be regarded as more or less unique. In His insistance on righteousness Jesus is in a class by Himself. Religion

means righteousness. It can mean nothing else in His Gospel.

We may now conclude this sketch on the originality of the Christian message by noting a general point of view or philosophy associated with Christianity. We here refer to the distinctive emphasis Jesus placed upon the value of the human individual, and the sacredness of every human life. The Oriental faiths are mostly careless of the individual. Pantheistic trends tend to wipe him out. It is a question whether the greatest teachers of India did not believe in the eventual absorption of the individual back into the divine. In any case there is not the emphasis on the individual and his importance, nor upon the sacredness of personality as such. From this emphasis in part has come our personalistic philosophy of today in the West. The central postulate of that philosophy is that the fundamental world-ground is personal and spiritual. The East would agree that the world-ground was spiritual, but would perhaps deny that it was personal. We can account for nothing in the universe except as we posit a person back of it. Only personal volition can explain anything. We believe that this place of personality is alone characteristic of the message of Jesus. Because of the emphasis He placed on personality, its sacredness and abiding character, He is sure to have wide acceptance in the era opening before us. The individual has too long been neglected in the Eastern world. They now awaken to prime importance of personality, human and divine. Their deep conviction that reality is spiritual, must now be permeated with this idea of Jesus: that it is also personal. In this idea of reality, of God, of man, Jesus is original and unique.

V

THE FINALITY OF CHRISTIANITY

HAVING shown that Christianity does possess a considerable measure of uniqueness, does it follow that it is the final faith? Can we safely conclude that it is the absolute religion? For many persons this question is crucial. They want to know whether we now have God's final and full revelation or do we look for another? If we are not certain that this is God's last word to man, then why do anything to propagate it? For these persons a belief in the utter finality of Christianity is essential to missions. For them the whole enterprise rests on the assumption of its absoluteness, its finality, and its completeness for all human needs now and forever. One feature of the present inquiry is to show that this last conclusion does not follow. We are bound to propagate Christianity, not because it is possible to demonstrate that it is God's last word to man, but because it is God's best word to man. Our engaging in missions will not depend upon being able to make such a logical demonstration of finality as such persons suggest.

Since we are to use these two words, " finality " and " absoluteness," we may as well try to indicate just what they mean in this discussion. By " absoluteness " we mean that a religion (Christianity) is free from error, or imperfection, complete in itself, perfect, whole, sufficient and lacking nothing. By " finality " we mean that no higher form of religion can be con-

ferred on mankind than is already conferred in Christianity, and that it cannot be surpassed now or in the future. These two words, if applied to Christianity, mean that in it we have God's final word to man, and it is ultimate in the sphere of religion.

We are immediately met by the criticism that such a claim is impossible, and cannot be proved and tends to beg the issue between Christianity and the other systems. The objector says that we do not know what a perfect religion is, indeed, that we cannot know what such a religion would be. We have no standard of perfection in religion or elsewhere. All we can possibly declare is that all systems of religion are only relatively perfect.

Again the objector to any doctrine of finality in religion argues that religious experience is partial, has not reached a perfect stage, but on the other hand there is every reason for believing that a greater religious experience will be realized by men of the future. He thinks it folly to look back to St. Paul or Martin Luther, or even to Jesus Christ for the complete and final standard of religious experience.

Once more the objector assures us that everything we know is relative, limited, fragmentary. Since Christianity is embedded in the stream of human history, it too must be relative and limited. He feels that it is folly to claim any kind of finality for anything that appears in time and space. Even Jesus Christ is subject to the law of relativity.

In answer to these statements, let it be frankly admitted that no logical proof of finality in Christianity can be brought. Here, as in so many great issues, logic does not suffice. Most really vital issues of life are beyond reason to explain, or logic to prove. We believe

that this is not the end of this question of finality. And what is still more significant for us here, our missionary enterprise does not depend upon any demonstration of logical finality in Christianity. However, there are facts to be considered which point to a finality in Christianity. We may direct attention first to the probability of such finality indicated in the evolutionary process. (In Vol. V of *The Outline of Christianity,* p. 444.)

Dr. E. D. Soper has argued for a kind of finality in Christianity on the basis that evolutionary processes reach an outside limit, and then are halted. He quotes Professor E. G. Conklin as declaring that " Biological progress, however, always has its limits; sooner or later differentiation reaches a stage beyond which it cannot go without destroying the internal balance or integration and the adaptability to external conditions." Then Professor Conklin goes on to say that the idea that human evolution—physical, intellectual, social—will go on forever in endless progress, has no facts to support it. The infinite perfectibility of man is not indicated in evolutionary doctrine, but rather that man reaches a limit beyond which he does not go. He then affirms that the Greeks reached the limits in physical and intellectual attainments never surpassed and not likely to be in the future. In artistic forms created, no notion has surpassed the Greeks. Instead of continued progress along these lines, evolution has been slowed down, or stopped. Professor J. Arthur Thompson has endorsed this view of evolution and recognizes that there are limits beyond which it cannot pass.

From this biological point of view we may infer that religious development may have reached a high point

in Judea, in the person of Jesus Christ, nineteen centuries ago. It is, therefore, entirely reasonable to believe that " high-water mark " was reached in Him.

In any case, we are not violating our best knowledge when we contend for the finality of Jesus Christ in the realm of religious life and experience. If we must believe that the Greeks reached the limit of human evolution in physical, intellectual, and artistic fields, how much easier is it to believe that religion reached a furthermost point among the Jews, and especially in the person of Jesus Christ?

Can we be so sure that the Absolute could not manifest Himself in a certain moment of time, and in a certain segment of human history? If it is impossible to prove a final revelation in Christianity or any other known system of religion, is it not quite as impossible to assert that the Aboslute has not already made itself known in time and space? The latter can no more be affirmed than the former. In our human experience there are the great creative epochs, great creative moments which are normative, when vast realities are clear as day, and become determinative in our lives. In some of these high moments something is given, or revealed which most men never see, and which, to us at least, are absolute. In the history of nations there is something that corresponds to these high moments in human experience. Nations, too, have the creative epochs. For a few years there is a tide of life which is creative and normative. Such epochs are easily discovered in Greece, Palestine, Arabia, India, China, and Persia. In these creative epochs great human personalities appear, new ideas and ideals of life. These personalities continue to be the normative forces of the nation for long afterwards. There is nothing illogical

about the appearance of Jesus Christ in Palestine in a given year of history, as normative personality which the world has not yet understood, much less caught up with His manner of life. Nor is there any *a priori* reason why this personality might not be a finality of its kind. We are not justified in the easy assumption so often made that the world is of necessity advancing all the time, and that it is inevitable that all earlier personalities and forces will be superseded.

All candid people must admit that there is a high degree of improbability that the person of Jesus will ever be surpassed. Nineteen hundred years of history testify to the fact that religion reached its classic expression in Jesus Christ. Never before has the life of God received such embodiment, and who can believe that a better will yet come? Religions have come and gone, and many will yet come and go, but religion as embodied in Jesus has not been surpassed, and we must agree is not likely to be. Islam is the one vital system developed since, that may be considered as a real rival, but what discriminating scholar believes that Christianity was surpassed in Islam? Much less does any student find in the character of Mohammed an equal of Jesus Christ.

When we stop and think upon it, there is every probability that no higher manifestation of God can come in time and space than came in Jesus Christ. Our boasted material and scientific progress does not aid men in discovering the things of the Spirit. Palestine with the simple rural life was a far more likely place for the birth of a spiritual genius than London or Chicago is today. In any case, we simply cannot imagine any finer, purer, nobler, or richer personality in the flesh, than Jesus. To this day men are unable

to point out infirmities in Him. He is all that we can imagine or conceive for human life, and infinitely more. Because this is so He has become the world's standard and norm in things religious. All religion must be weighed, measured, and valued in view of what Jesus was. That He is the world's first religious figure goes without much proof. Moreover, few really entertain hope of a better in human form and flesh. It is safe to assume that no higher form of human life will ever appear on earth, even if the world stands for untold ages. Here, then, in Jesus Christ we have some sort of an absolute. So far as human life goes, we have a finality.

The genius of Jesus Christ is best exhibited in the type of religious life and experience He creates. He not only possessed a unique experience of God Himself, but He possessed the genius of bringing other men into something of that experience. The consciousness of God which He possessed in such amazing degree, He is able to make over to His followers, at least in measure. It may indeed be contended that there is an element or aspect of finality in the experience into which He inducts men. That relationship is sonship and heirship in the New Testament. God is the Father of every man. Religion consists in establishing man in the full consciousness of this relationship with God as Father. This relationship of Father and son is in its totality all that religion can ever mean. That is to say that there can never be a higher relationship than sonship. The filial spirit and filial devotion is the sum total of religious affiliation. Jesus has demonstrated His ability to induct men into the filial relation with God as Father. Moreover, He is able to give men such power and insight that they are maintained in the consciousness of

that relationship. Such an experience of God savours of finality and yet is an ever expanding experience. It is final in the sense that within the bounds of this relationship there is included every possible advance of man toward God, and true relationship with God. Such a relationship involves all the possible adventures of the religious life. Men may differ in the degree in which they realize this relationship, but all possibilities are open now, and no man can advance beyond the limits of this relationship. A new race of men may discover new ranges of this experience with God the Father, but they cannot supersede the experience itself. Men can never be more than Sons of the Eternal Father, but they may discover a richness in that relationship that we fail to discover. Beyond such a relationship man can never go. So in this sense of relating men to God, Jesus has finality. From this point it might also be contended that there is finality in the type of religious character created, for that is determined by the relationship of which we have been speaking.

A caution is necessary at this point in our argument. It is not contended that this norm of religion in Jesus Christ is now or ever has been perfectly understood or interpreted. Men have not caught up with His experience or with the ethical demands He makes upon them. This is to say that we do not yet understand His full meaning for religion. What we do know is that every fresh manifestation of religious life in our Western world has been the result of fresh study and understanding of Jesus Christ. There is a dynamic in the pristine fact of Christianity that is inexhaustible. The more we draw upon it, the more certain we become that it is the absolute source of religious power.

The full meaning of Jesus Christ for human life has not been grasped. Our present interpretations will doubtless be surpassed. There is infinite progress in that understanding. Christian thought is a progressive thing. This is especially true of our thought of Jesus Christ. Our contention is that progress in the future will be in the direction of a better understanding of Jesus Christ, and not in setting Him aside for another. There is ample room for fresh interpretations. Those who know the Orient best believe we may eventually have such fresh and enriching interpretations of Jesus from that quarter. This must be conceded as entirely possible.

Such an investigation as we here seek to make does at least create a big probability that Jesus possessed some sort of absoluteness. There is every probability that He will not be surpassed. Indeed, the factors in the situation practically prove that He will not be surpassed, though the logical demonstration may be lacking. The factors taken together create for all reasonable people a practical demonstration of finality.

Those who hold to the view that a better religion will arrive some day, seem to think that Jesus Christ can be utilized in some kind of eclectic system, and by combining Him with the best elements in other systems man will obtain the perfect religion. As we have shown elsewhere in this volume, eclecticism is attractive to certain types of mind. Such a process would save the pride of different races. But the great creative and reconstructive forces of the world do not wait upon man's pride. Whatever religion may be in the future, it must have a dynamic organizing centre, and that Jesus Christ will be that centre is the only

contention made here. The idea that certain desirable features of various systems can be amalgamated, and the perfect religion will result, is quite adolescent in character, and can be accepted only by the person with no knowledge of history. All religious history indicates the improbability of such an achievement. As Dr. Fairbairn put it long ago, "Religions are not made, they grow." A religion must be a growth. There must be a dynamic centre of life, which organizes the whole.

The conclusion is that there is little likelihood that Jesus Christ will be superseded, either by a new system or religion or by any eclectic system built up mechanically from the best elements of all religious systems. We agree heartily with Mr. A. C. Bouquet when he says: "Unsurpassable? No, if it is a question of our understanding of Christianity in thought and life. Unsurpassable? Yes, if it is a question of the Christ who was in Jesus, who gives His Spirit to the spirits of every age."

It may not be out of place to set down here what may be called tokens of finality in Christianity. These are not set down as logical proof of finality, but as indications of a high degree of probability. Looking at Christianity through nineteen hundred years of history and in its spread through many lands, and the various historical forms it has taken, a series of statements may be made which go far toward proving it to be a final faith. The list will be brief, and no comment will be necessary.

Tokens of Finality in Christianity

1. There is the capacity of Christianity for endless growth, self-renewal, and progress without limit.

2. History shows it as evolving into its true self, its truly characteristic life and character, the likeness of Jesus.

3. History shows that it possesses power to absorb the best in any environment into which it comes, and yet retain its own true character.

4. History reveals its ability to adapt itself to all peoples, to all stages of culture, to all environments, a truly universal faith.

5. It is truly international in character. It does not belong to Europe alone, or to the heat belt, or to the primitive tribes, but is inter-racial and international in outlook and interest.

6. It makes high demands upon its followers, but provides a spiritual dynamic which enables true disciples to attain those higher ethical standards.

7. Attention must also be given to the emphasis upon personality. Its personalistic philosophy is in striking contrast to all fatalistic, pantheistic, and mechanical systems found in other faiths.

8. It stands out especially in its conception of God, as Christlike, as a divine Father, and other qualities ascribed to God. (Jesus Christ has given a meaning to the term God that is unique, a definition and fixation, that may be regarded as final.)

9. It is most unique and final in the personality of Jesus Christ, He being unapproachable, and has no real competitor in the whole field of religion, sinless and perfect as man, and saving and forgiving as God.

10. Christianity possesses a power to transform human character, and make of men new creatures, by a definite process of spiritual regeneration, an experience attainable now and here.

11. In its ability to furnish social ideals, and an

inner compulsion for their attainment, and plans to save not individuals alone, but society as a whole.

These are some of the tokens of finality found in Christianity. A religion so rich in fundamental ideas, and so abundantly provided with spiritual motive power can hardly be surpassable. This paragraph may well be closed with a further statement by Bouquet, quoted above. He says: "I am convinced that the evidence taken as a whole shows it to be in the highest degree improbable that there can ever be any new or higher religion to supersede Christianity. . . . I firmly hold Christianity to be in essence the common world religion of the future, for whose triumph and dominance we must all work, and whose spread will involve the breaking down of all nationalistic, or racial barriers, and the establishment of a world commonwealth of all peoples, nations, languages, a consummation for which the whole earth waits today with as fervent an anxiety as those who waited for the redemption of Jerusalem nineteen centuries ago."

VI

CHRISTIANITY AND OTHER RELIGIONS

IT is our purpose here to discuss briefly the relation of Christianity to other living systems of religion, especially the great religious systems of the Orient. Our hope is merely to make a few suggestions rather than to reach definite conclusions. Our task as here conceived is not that of making a comparative study of the various religions; but on the basis of such a comparative study, and in view of the results of that study, to ask what attitude should Christianity take toward other systems. Our problem is forced upon us by the comparative study of recent years, which yields the general conclusion that religions have much in common, and that other systems have values hitherto unrecognized generally by Christians. If we admit this general conclusion, can we still believe in the uniqueness of Christianity and regard it as a supplement to or completion of these systems? Does such a conclusion render belief in uniqueness of Christianity impossible? We can hardly continue to believe in the destruction of these systems. Our attitude needs to be defined in view of the knowledge of these systems we possess today.

By common consent one of the primary issues confronting missionary leaders today is found in this question of the relation of Christianity to other age-old systems. An answer to this question is urgent at this moment, and the sooner some agreement can be

reached the better it will be for all concerned. It is just possible that the successful cultivation of the missionary programme in the churches await such an answer. If in the final analysis it should turn out that Christianity is only one of the world's religions, without special uniqueness, and possessing no element of finality, it is altogether certain that missionary enthusiasm would soon fall to the zero point. We therefore propose to look at this problem and see whether the uniqueness of Christianity can still be maintained, after we admit large values in other faiths.

1. *The Comparative Study of Religion.* We may repeat that great fear is entertained in some quarters because it is believed that the findings of comparative study will gradually destroy the claim of Christianity to uniqueness. Such persons feel that such study must eventuate in equality of all religions. Others believe that no such fear need be entertained. We need not fear that the fuller study of religions will prove their equality. Investigations reveal religions, not only numerous, but in every stage of development. No one with knowledge can say these religions are alike. Some are infinitely below the great ethnic systems of the Orient, to say nothing of Christianity. We need not be concerned lest a state of equality is proclaimed, except among those either ignorant or willing to slur over and minimize differences. On the other hand, it grows clearer year by year that Christianity is in by far the best position to meet the criticism directed at religion in general, and to maintain a leadership among religions that is unique. As Christians, we may well rejoice in all findings so far, and rest in the confidence that in any case truth is better than ignorance, and that since Christianity is founded in the truth it has

nothing to fear from the fullest investigation of religions. On the contrary, this study will enhance its position, and more and more commend it as the highest reach of revelation in our world, a revelation not likely to be equalled now or in the future.

2. *Some Reassuring Results of Such Study.* First of all, such investigations prove that religion plays a tremendous part in human life, in every race and nation. The importance of religion to the whole life of a people finds overwhelming proof. Religion is indeed man's chief business, and constitutes a major interest for him almost universally. No peoples have been discovered which have no religion. "It is now the prevailing opinion among anthropologists that religion in some form or other is universal." (See G. F. Moore, *Birth and Growth of Religion.*)

It may be taken as certain that such study proves that man is everywhere, by nature, religious. Hence no race has been discovered without religious rites and ceremonies, however simple or primitive they may be in some cases. Man is truly a religious animal. Superhuman powers are recognized, and worship in some form is indulged. This religious nature in man finds vent in ways strikingly similar in different parts of the world. There is here unlooked-for evidence of the unity of the human family and the similarity of spiritual and mental qualities and powers. The missionary may be sure that he will never find an unreligious people, nor one that in the long run will not be interested in religion.

Such study also reveals various stages of religious evolution. It shows us people in which religion seems to be still on the animistic plane, and in which there is but little of what we call morality. Modern study of

religions has wiped out the old distinction between natural and revealed religions. Today we recognize that all religions give evidence of a degree of revelation. In the higher stages the gods take on the nobler qualities, and exhibit a type of character not found in the lower stages. Another aspect of evolution is seen in the fact that some religions are national only, while others have a universal outlook and are therefore missionary. Again some are revealed in connection with their founders. Evidently the religions with great personal founders have some decided advantages over those that do not have.

Such study also shows that every religion has value for the people professing it. In every one there is inspiration and consolation for its devotees. We have been prone to think that the devotee got nothing out of his worship, and his ceremonies, and all the sacrifice he is called upon to make. Such is an erroneous view. As Max Müller says, "There never was a false god, or a false religion." That is, there is no religion but which has some truth and value in it. There is no religion but that ministers in measure to man's needs. This means that the one God of the universe has been present in some measure, and to some extent, in all religious forms and ceremonies. It means that we can detect evidences of inspiration, and tokens of revelation in these systems. In this sense all religions are of God, and therefore should be respected by us. A man's religion is his most sacred belief and most important practice. It ill becomes a prophet of God to jest over the prayers of other religionists as did Elijah on the occasion of his contest with the priests of Baal. Religion of every sort is worthy of our reverence and respect, although we may revolt before its outward

acts or its symbolism. Religion, in each and every one of its forms, is man's aspiration for God, and his attempt to meet and appease God. His ceremonies and rites are his prayers. We should never belittle them.

In all of this there is great gain for the missionary. These results made available to him place him deeply in debt to the students of religion. He has little to oppose in the findings so far. He has, on the other hand, much to help him in appreciating and understanding the people he seeks to work with. We must now ask more specifically, what is his attitude toward other religions to be? We must especially consider this question in view of the presence of truth in all systems. We may, first of all, try to state the meaning of revelation in other systems, or, "the hand of God in other faiths." We shall do this at some length, since it is of fundamental importance today.

3. *A Guiding Principle.* We need some fundamental principle to guide us in the study of the relation of Christianity to other systems of religion found throughout the world. The present writer believes such a principle is found in the idea of God's immanence, and His quest of men in all ages and in all nations, or His self-revelation. To be more specific, we may assume that "Man's search after God is but the consequence of God's antecedent and incessant quest for man." (See W. F. Warren's *Religions of the World.*) We propose to examine this general idea as a clue to the solution of our problem. Let us see whether we can accept the idea that God has not left Himself without a witness anywhere among the nations? Even in the words of Jesus, some ground for accepting such a principle is at least suggester. He spoke of "the light that

lighteth every man that cometh into the world." He also referred to " other sheep than those found in the Jewish fold." However, it must be conceded that these words cannot carry us far toward an answer to our question.

It is evident that in the Acts and in Romans, particularly, St. Paul points to a much wider and more universal activity of God than is ordinarily conceived. He is there represented as not only working for the creation and preservation of the world, but in human history, and especially in the individual conscience. It may not be possible to prove that these statements justify the conclusion that he recognized a universal revelation to the nations, and among all peoples, but such an inference would be entirely in accord with his statements. It certainly is no harder to believe in a universal revelation than a universal providence. If we are to believe in the sovereignty of God and that He has controlled human history, it certainly is no greater demand upon our faith to accept the idea that He has always sought avenues of revelation in every nation. We would therefore expect that His truth would be found in some measure among all the peoples. St. Paul certainly does recognize in Acts, chapters 14 to 17, that the Athenians knew something of God. " What therefore ye ignorantly worship, this set I forth unto you." He does not propose to destroy their religion, but to perfect it. This did not mean that he approved all the practices of their religion, for he clearly indicates that he thought it lacked much, and that what their religion lacked he had come to bring to them in the religion of Jesus. He felt compelled to recognize that, in some measure, God had revealed Himself to the Greeks. His words about a law written on the hearts of Gentiles

would seem best interpreted in this way. (See Howell's *Soul of India,* p. 431.)

It is noteworthy that the great apologists of the early Church did not limit God's revelation to the Jews and Christians. They made bold to claim all truth as coming from God. Greek philosophy and poetry was a revelation. These partook of the spermatic word or Logos. They builded on this principle of God's witness among the nations. Thus they took up a friendly attitude toward truth wherever found. They believed that all truth was fully rounded out or completed in Christ the Word. They were inclined to regard Greek philosophy as at least a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ. (See Clement-Stromata, chap. V.) On the whole, they were unwilling to attribute the work of the Greeks to an evil spirit, but, rather, to the inspiration of the Logos, which they conceived as working in philosophers and poets alike. Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Clement of Alexandria, and others express this point of view.

Justin Martyr may first be quoted.

"We have been taught that Christ is the first born of God, and we have declared above that He is the Word of whom every race of men are partakers.

"All have been hated in whom the Word has dwelt. Such, for example, were those of the Stoic School—since as far as their moral teachings went they were admirable, as were also the poets in some particulars *on account of the seed of reason implanted in every race of men.*

"*For whatever law-givers or philosophers uttered well, they elaborated by finding and contemplating some part of the Word.*

"I confess that I boast, and with all my strength

strive to be found a Christian, not because the teachings of Plato are different from those of Christ, but because they are not in all respects similar, as neither are those of the others, Stoics, poets, and historians. *For each man spoke well in proportion to the share he had of the spermatic Word.* But they who contradict themselves on the more important points appear not to have possessed the heavenly wisdom—whatever things were rightly said among all men, are the property of us Christians.

" For not only among the Greeks did reason (Logos) prevail to condemn these things through Socrates, but also among the Barbarians were they condemned by reason, who took shape and became man and was called Jesus Christ." (See Justin Martyr, *First Apology,* chapter 46, and *Second Apology,* chapters 8, 10, 13.)

Clement says, " For into all men whatever, especially those who are occupied with intellectual pursuits, *a Divine effluence has been instilled;* wherefore, though reluctantly, they confess that God is one, indestructible, unbegotten." He also speaks of the poets bearing testimony to the truth.

Here is an attitude toward other systems of truth than the Christian, which may serve as a model for us today. We are compelled to take up a more generous and tolerant attitude toward the great religious systems of the Orient. The course may not be fraught with as much danger as at first appears.

We do not propose here a discussion of the various religious systems, but no one can study these systems sympathetically and not become convinced that these peoples have been taught much that Christianity teaches. They, too, have had their holy men who have

been able to hear the voice of God. They have had their teachers who loved spiritual truth. They have at least been ardent seekers after God through long years. That their yearnings and strivings have not found a measure of reward one cannot believe. This is not to say that they reached a fulness of truth, or that truth once discovered has not often been lost or covered over with untruth. We have every reason for believing that the Gospel of Christ will come to them as the fuller truth, and as the completion of what they have learned. We find in approaching them that they are not wholly ignorant of spiritual matters. As some missionary has said, he never preached in a village where God had not been there before him. This conclusion cannot be overturned by showing that multitudes in these lands are destitute of high spiritual ideals, and live degraded lives. On this same ground the Christian revelation would also be condemned. Let us now see what this idea of a witness to the nations implies for our own faith, and what our approach to the non-Christian people should be in view of it.

When the theologians of a hundred years ago made their extravagant claims for Christianity as the only true religion, or as the only inspired religion (and declared other systems to be of the devil) they little understood the suicidal implications involved, nor yet how soon they would have to recede from that position and take up a more tolerant attitude. They evidently did not understand how completely suicidal such a view is to any faith in God. We cannot believe in a selfish God, nor yet a partial God, one who excludes some of the peoples of the world from His interest and care, and who makes Himself known only to a chosen people. We simply cannot believe in a God who thus

acts arbitrarily and leaves the mass of humanity out of His plans; as we have seen such was not the attitude of St. Paul nor of the apologists of the early Church.

It is unthinkable that God could have restricted Himself to one people alone in revealing Himself to the race. (See Hough, *Productive Beliefs,* pp. 163, 164, 165.) To have to accept the dictum that God has spoken to the ancient Hebrews, but not to the Hindus, would be to place a burden upon our faith in the goodness of God, that it could not bear. Our conception of God requires us to believe that God has revealed Himself through many channels, " and that he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted of him." That God is no respecter of persons or nations is an essential part of our belief about God and His activities. So when, in such a study as this, we discover that the various systems contain fundamental truths alike, we are not disturbed lest the devil has invented a doctrine among them in imitation of the Christian truth; but rejoice in the evidence of God's presence and revelation among these peoples. It surely must be a comfort to know that God has been busy among them also, and has left no people without a witness, but has given a measure of revelation, that is such a measure as they were able to receive.

Dr. William F. Warren, of Boston University, used to say to his students that there were no heathen in the world. The Greeks talked about Barbarians, an ugly term for all non-Greeks. The Hebrews thought of themselves as the chosen people of God, and all others as Gentiles. More recently we have used the term heathen (another ugly term) for all non-Christians. But Dr. Warren was right. If by heathen we mean men or races whom God has not touched, there are

none, for God has been busy with all of them, giving them such a measure of truth as they could receive.

This basic fact of a universal revelation is not to be taken in the sense that once long ago there was a universal revelation to all the peoples, acquainting them with the essential teachings about God, man and salvation, just as given in our Bible. There is little evidence of such a mechanical procedure on the part of God, as that implies. There was a theory about primitive Monotheism having been the universal belief of mankind, and that there was a fall of man away from Monotheism to many gods and idolatry. According to this view, man began at a high level religiously and then corrupted this high faith and invented idolatry and fell very far down. History gives no proof of such a period of universal Monotheism. In all the advanced peoples there can be found individuals (Prophets-Seers—who reached up to this more lofty faith and saw it at least darkly. But that Monotheism was ever a universal idea must be doubted. Moreover, the presence of these enlightened seers in the advanced nations caught in outline the higher truths of religion is only proof of what we claimed above—God's universal effort or striving to reveal Himself everywhere, and that the advanced systems represent a goodly measure of truth.

This basic fact of a universal witness among the peoples can alone enable us to believe in God at all. Moreover, such a view is needed to explain religious evolution as it is portrayed in the story of all the advanced systems. Such a view enables us to understand why the great seers of the great systems teach similar truths, though coming at them in a different way.

It is time Christians accepted this basic principle and sought to work out its implications for their faith.

It is time we understood what this basic truth means to missions, and the efforts of the Christian churches to promote Christianity around the world. Some will assert at once that if it is true missions are unnecessary —that it will cut the tap root of missions. That this will not be the result of accepting the present view of other religions is quite certain. Missions do not depend upon the view that the peoples have no light and no truth at all. To say that we are obligated to go to men only who are utterly and wholly in darkness is to completely misconceive our aim and our obligation. The man across the street, though he has a Bible in his home, and every chance to know the plan of salvation, may still need us. No, we are obligated to get him to act upon the truth he already knows or has the opportunity to know. So conceivably the missionary task is not confined to pressing upon peoples truth and a manner of life they are wholly ignorant of, but to press for the acceptance and use of truths they already possess, at least in a measure. If the Hindus could be induced to accept the highest elements of Hinduism it would be a great advance. If the Chinese could be induced to actually live up to the highest truths of Confucianism, it would be entirely worth doing. Now the missionary task is not limited to inducing peoples to live up to their best, but includes the pressing of peoples to go on and accept the highest truths given to man in Jesus Christ. Now as a matter of fact, most of the effort of a missionary practically consists in doing just what we have said. He gets his first point of contact by pointing out their own teachings which they neglect, but which they should honour. Then he shows them the more perfect way as outlined in Christianity. They find much in the Christian message

which commends itself as an extension or completion of what they already know.

We shall certainly see our task in a very different light when we come to accept this basic principle of a universal witness of God among the nations. First of all, this point will have profound influence on our total conception of God. We have been thinking of God as the special possession of the ancient Jew, and in modern times, of the Western peoples. The God whom we have believed in has been a very partial God, especially prejudiced in favour of our race and our Western civilization. It was very hard for Peter and his Jewish consorts to get the idea that the God revealed by Jesus was an impartial God, and no respecter of persons. It has also been hard for us to reach up to a conception of God which makes Him the Father of all mankind.

Nothing will help us so much as to actually believe that God has been active in all ages for the whole human race. It must be a consoling fact to find His footsteps in the other religious systems as well as in our own. He will be a very different Being to most of us, once that thought of God takes hold upon us. It becomes more and more clear that the missionary enterprise can only rest on this new conception of God's activities among the peoples, and it is equally certain that the conception will revolutionize theology as well.

The missionary enterprise has rested in part upon the false notion of complete ignorance and fundamental error among all non-Christian peoples. It did not accept the idea of God's witness having already been born to the peoples, and consequently a measure of truth among them. Missionaries have considered it as part of their task to paint the non-Christians in the darkest possible colours. For them to admit any con-

siderable measure of light and truth would seem to vacate their mission, and negate all their purposes. So he felt he had to paint a dark picture. Of course he could find the colours for his dark picture of dire human need. They could have found colours for a dark picture in America or Europe, also, and arrived at the same kind of argument or conclusion that Christian lands also need a new religion. There was, and is, much truth in the dark picture drawn, but we did not see that the inferences drawn were too sweeping, and might as well be drawn concerning so-called Christian lands. It was not necessary to prove by these pictures that India or China were wholly without light and truth. Had they looked a little farther they would have found some individuals of other faiths who held to very similar notions to themselves, and these would have been proof that the light and truth had broken over a small part of the land at least. Perhaps a still wider search might have shown that light and truth had already been popularly rejected in India and China, and that possibly the first thing was to awaken people to the best their race had been taught, as well as to receive a new light from without.

That we must now emphasize this aspect of the situation is clear enough. In fact, we hear it popularly said on platform and pulpit that there is much truth in the other systems which must be recognized and preserved. (See Hough, *Productive Beliefs,* p. 155.) Yet, one is left wondering how many of those making such statements understand their implications. What do such admissions mean for the missionary enterprise? Well, for one thing, it means a bigger, more human, more vital conception of God; and, as we have been trying to say, a new attitude on the part of mis-

sionaries toward the other systems. It means the frank acceptance of truth in these systems, though not the perfect truth of Jesus Christ.

It means among other things that we must be willing to learn from the non-Christian peoples as well as to teach. Now this must apply to the religious life, and not merely to the social, literary, artistic, or musical realm. We very plainly can learn much along these latter lines. However, our fundamental admission that God has taught these peoples, also means that we must be willing to learn something more about God and His way of life, through the experience of these races. The writer is well aware how embarrassing it is to make such a concession after the claims we have made. Many Christians will resent the suggestion, and call us traitors to our faith. But let it be recalled that we have here only made one fundamental admission, and that one is scriptural; namely, that God has not left Himself without a witness in these lands and peoples. We have simply declared that He has found voices in these races as well as among Hebrews and Europeans. We have merely contended that the scriptural inference is that some measure of saving truth has been made over to these peoples as well as to ourselves. It may be that these voices were more nearly voices crying in the wilderness than was the result in Christian lands, and that the higher truths went largely unheeded, but that does not alter the facts involved. It may be that the prophetic voices from age to age were not so passionately prophetic as in Israel and in the Christian Church, but this will not negate the main contentions here made.

Says Dr. A. E. Garvie, " The comparative study of religions, instead of disproving, confirms the fact of

divine revelation. Religion is too universal and permanent a reality in human history to be treated as an illusion, or even as an aspiration which has no certainty of satisfaction. Our theory of knowledge must be enlarged to make room for that knowledge of the Divine which is claimed in all religions. The universal revelation does not exclude the special revelation which is claimed in Christianity." (See *Missionary Obligation*, p. 94.)

Such a view as we have here presented does not destroy the unique character or final form of Christian revelation. The special revelation of the New Testament may be accepted, and its higher quality affirmed. Nor does such a view destroy the missionary programme of Christianity. It should make the work of missions all the more attractive. It does, however, make a restatement of aims and objectives necessary. It is evident that, to a considerable extent, we do not go to people totally benighted, but with a certain measure of training in religion. Christianity must remember it has a mission to the externally good man, as well as to the bad man. Jesus Himself came to the people having the best religion on earth. We must always remember that every man has a right, not merely to what is good in religion, but what is best. Here again, the good stands in place of the best. We must persuade other religionists that they must not be satisfied with a part of the truth, but that life requires the whole truth. In all of this, our point of view is that Christ came to fulfil, and not to destroy, and that point of view we must now seek to expound more fully.

4. *The Danger of Syncretism.* The discussions of the Jerusalem Conference in 1928 showed that there are many excellent persons who believe that the whole

missionary movement is imperiled today by the drift toward syncretism in religion. Our recognition of values in other systems of religion seems to endanger belief in the uniqueness of Christianity. These persons can see no way out of the present situation except to assert the futility of other faiths, and the proclamation of Christianity as the one absolute religion. They would make no admissions of the truth in other systems, nor attempt any effort at adjusting such truth to that of Christianity. Such a view is well stated by Dr. R. E. Speer, in a recent address, and runs as follows:

"Our issue in the world today is whether there is any redemptive world mission in the name of Christ that is universally valid. Have we in Christianity the universal and absolute and final faith, or have we need of merging our Western culture in with the cultures of the East? That has always been a problem with the missionaries. And behind the missionary problem of the Church at home is the view that we do not have in Christianity the basic historical faith, that the object of missions is not to carry on the faith in Christ, but that it is to share our religious experience with the world. The idea is advanced that we are to conceive of our task as taking our religious experience and mingling it with the best religious experience of the East. The Christian faith is not the ultimate faith, but is one of a group of faiths, a matchless but imperfect attempt at the ultimate faith which is to be achieved by gathering up of them all into one great synthesis."

If the case stood exactly as Dr. Speer puts it, we should possibly have to agree with him. But it is not necessary, we believe, to admit the relative character of Christianity in order to believe that other religions

have a considerable measure of truth and are, therefore, worthy to be preserved. Nor do we believe that it follows that there will be a syncretistic religion as a result. Christian history, Hindu history and Buddhistic history all go to prove that syncretism, as such, is not a desirable goal.

Syncretism may be defined as an attempt to fuse more or less variant systems of philosophy or religions. The purpose is thus to secure unity and destroy conflict between systems or religions. Such efforts, when undertaken, generally result in a hybrid system. As we shall see later, nearly all such efforts are artificial in character, and never succeed in securing an organic whole such as is sought for. It must be admitted that the human mind tends toward some general synthesis in which the disharmony of systems disappear. However attractive the process may seem, the goal is never achieved by any such artificial procedure as syncretism involves. Nevertheless, there are many today who hope that existing systems of religion can be fused and blended so as to preserve all that is good, and throw over all that is undesirable. Thus, none of the systems are to continue to exist, and all will be lost in the new amalgam. Such persons would be willing to sacrifice much in our various systems in order to achieve unity and destroy competition and struggle between the religions. They would blur over differences, exaggerate similarities, and assume the essential sameness of all religions. They would agree with Pope's Universal Prayer:

> *"Father of all! in every age,*
> *In every clime adored,*
> *By saint, by savage, and by sage,*
> *Jehovah, Jove or Lord."*

Eclecticism means a patchwork of ideas, and however attractive it may seem on the surface, such a result is to be dreaded, as Prof. W. E. Hocking told the Jerusalem Conference. He sympathized with those who hated syncretism in religion, for there can be no real life in such a system. However, he warned the Conference that such fear of syncretism must not prevent us from showing hospitality to all truth from whatever source it comes. He further declared that what we feared was the loss of identity. But he also asserted that we need not entertain any fear that Christianity would lose its own identity. This exactly expresses what many of us feel today; namely, that Christianity is so dynamic that its identity cannot be lost through friendly approach and contact with other systems. It will be the yeast hidden in the measures of meal, and will not be lost thereby. (See W. E. Hockings remarks, "The Christian Message," of the Jerusalem Report.)

Syncretism, as here suggested, is not a desirable end. That any vital religion or vital philosophy can be created by syncretistic methods is surely a delusion. A vital religion cannot be created by such a method. Dr. A. M. Fairbairn was right when he said: "Strictly speaking, religions are not made, they grow: for growth is the process which life follows where it builds up an organism for its own habitation and enlargement. Opposed to growth is the process we may call contrivance or manufacture, which is represented in religion by syncretism, or the attempt by the conscious selection and adjustment of old materials to create a new cult or system. Now this process has been known in both ancient and modern times, the age in which Christianity was born being particularly familiar with it—but

syncretism in religion, like eclecticism in philosophy, is a sign of decadence, for it creates nothing that outlives the age or the coterie which gives it birth." With this we must be in entire agreement, and the hopes entertained in some quarters, that the true and final religion will be created by selecting the best of each and all the systems, is doomed to failure. (See *Philosophy of Religion,* p. 517.)

We have indicated that many syncretistic efforts have been made in the past, and from these we should be able to learn some useful lessons. There are the early efforts of the second to the fourth centuries. The history of gnosticism is instructive in this connection. Professor Williston Walker, of Yale, regarded the whole gnostic movement as a distinct peril to the Church for a number of reasons, but particularly because of its syncretistic trend. In his history of the Church he says:

" Gnosticism was an immense peril for the Church. It cut out the historic foundations of Christianity. Its God is not the God of the Old Testament which is the work of an inferior or evil being. Its Christ had no real incarnation, death, or resurrection. Its salvation is for the few capable of spiritual enlightenment. The peril was the greater because gnosticism was represented by some of the keenest minds in the Church of the second century. *The age was syncretistic,* and in some respects gnosticism was but the fullest accomplishment of that amalgamation of Hellenic and Oriental philosophical speculation with primitive Christian beliefs which was in greater or less degree in process in all Christian thinking."

Gnosticism may be regarded as one tremendous effort to relate various Oriental cults and their philoso-

phies to that of Greek philosophy, and Christianity. Any such effort was certain to reject fundamental parts of each system and to create a unity, which was really no unity at all, but a conglomeration of philosophies and religions. The whole movement is but so much proof that unity and harmony cannot be secured that way. Even less ground exists for believing that the final religion can be built up by such a mechanical process. The danger of syncretism continued on down into the fourth century, whether it was championed by Gnostics, Marcionites, Montanists, or Platonists. In the end Christianity emerged deeply influenced without doubt, but still maintaining itself as a system, and proving itself far more dynamic than any or all the contending philosophies or religions.

Another effort in this direction may be found in India in connection with the Samaj movements and certain reform cults. The Brahma Samaj has been the most pronounced in this direction of eclecticism. Ram Mohun Roy, the founder, was a Hindu who had contacts with both Christianity and Mohammedanism. He had imbibed much from both sources. Yet he clung tenaciously to what he considered true in Hinduism. He never went to such extremes of eclecticism as did some of his successors, yet it was no doubt part of his programme. Later there was a definite effort to draw together the liberal minded of whatever faith in an eclectic movement and creed. On the whole, the leaders of the movement borrowed extensively from other faiths, particularly Christianity. Some of them were on the verge of professing Christianity, but, in the end, shrank from such a step, and clung to the hope of some kind of an eclecticism being created. In later years, the movement has lost very much in in-

fluence and membership. It is but another illustration of the weakness of all syncretistic efforts.

Another Indian illustration is found in the Rama Krishna cult, which continues to exercise considerable influence on a limited group of disciples. Here we are only interested in the eclecticism of the movement. That the idea of syncretism is very prominent can hardly be questioned. At the Parliament of Religions at Chicago, in 1893, Swami Vivikananda, a close disciple of Rama Krishna, and probably quoting him, said: " If there is to be a universal religion, it must be that one which will be infinite, like the God it will reach; whose sun will shine upon the followers of Krishna and Christ, saints and sinners alike; which will not be the Brahmans' or Buddhists', the Christians' or Mohammedans' religion, *but the sum total of all of these,* and still have space for development." This view is held more or less widely in India and the whole of the East. The difficulties of such a view are little understood, and it is therefore widely accepted. In a general way these people believe religions are equally true, and sufficient, and a Hindu should be a Hindu, a Mohammedan a follower of Mohammed, etc. But many of them believe the true religion will be some amalgam of all the systems, and that no religion now known can claim to be unique, superior, or final, and that therefore all missionary work is wrong.

Professor J. N. Farquhar, in his brilliant volume on *Religious Movements in India,* tells how Rama Krishna believed the religions could be harmonized into one grand whole, and prints the picture made to illustrate the idea, in which a Christian Church, a Mohammedan Mosque and a Hindu Temple appear together, with prominent representatives of each religion, including

the figure of Jesus. This effort again illustrates the futility of proceeding that way. All such efforts merely gloss over the actual differences which exist. Unity and harmony cannot be achieved that way, much less the final religion of mankind.

In any movement toward unity in religion, there must be one dynamic, organizing centre. One may surmise that, as Christianity proved to be that organizing and dynamic centre of the movement in the Roman Empire, so it will be in the Orient today and tomorrow. We cannot believe that there is as much danger of syncretism as some suppose, though, of course, such an outcome is possible. But there is enough danger to warn us against certain types of compromise which might seem attractive. It is also enough to cause us to rethink our whole position and to become reassured as to the uniqueness of Jesus Christ, and His ability to save the entire world.

We, therefore, sympathize with the position of our German delegates at the Jerusalem Conference who contended for the Gospel as the record of a unique and special act of God for the redemption of all mankind. Its uniqueness and indispensableness we fully accept. We further believe that to present Jesus Christ as a complete Saviour and Redeemer of men is the duty of the missionary. There is full salvation in none other. We quite agree with the statement of these brethren as reported in the address of Dr. Speer, that "However great our appreciation of the religious values and forces of other religions may be, we simply may not and cannot move from the fundamental base and nerve of all real missionary activity! That God revealed Himself by His saving acts toward mankind in history, and in an absolutely unique and unsurpassable way in

Jesus Christ, who is the way to come to the Father, the divine token of mercy and reconciliation. Jerusalem must have a clear and unambiguous message to the world on this point." (See *Jerusalem Report,* Volume I, p. 346.)

But we are unable to agree further, however, that such a faith is destroyed by believing in the continued immanence of God, or His presence and work in other than the Hebrew and Christian Church, the omnipresence and constant ministry of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of men outside Christian circles. We do not share the dread that admissions of truth in other systems will destroy the uniqueness and finality of Christianity as a system of salvation. We feel to the contrary, " That it is not only a Christian duty but a Christian privilege to detect with joy and thankfulness all that is sublime and God-like in the non-Christian systems, yea, that it must be our privelege to formulate this for the adherents of those systems better than they can do for themselves."

Conclusion: Can Christianity Be the Fulfilment of Other Systems of Religion?

The attempt to state more specifically the relation of Christianity to other systems is admittedly difficult. To go still further and try to indicate what the outcome of all the competition and struggle for mastery is likely to be is even more difficult. Christians are sure to press the question, will Christianity finally become the religion of mankind or is it more probably that Buddhism or some other system will make universal conquest, or that possibly the religion of the future will be none of these, but some system which gathers up the best of all—in a word, a new religion? Many

earnest and sincere people are asking for a more specific statement of the situation than has yet been made.

The conversion of the world to Christ has been understood to mean the complete domination of the Christian system over all competitors. It was the expectation that the non-Christian systems would be destroyed root and branch. In recent years a vast change has come over our thought. The values of the other systems are apparent. There is much that coincides with the Christian system. That they contain much error must also be recognized. That they are not adequate may be affirmed with little fear of contradiction. But we can hardly believe that the truth they hold is to be destroyed. We must believe that this truth will be conserved in some way. We do not now seek their overthrow. Can we find any view that will enable us to believe in the conservation of all that is true in these systems, and at the same time preserve the uniqueness of Christianity?

An analysis of the situation shows that there are several possible views. *First,* we may believe with the earlier missionaries that Christianity is to gain dominance by the wholesale destruction of other systems. This view we have already discarded. Or *secondly,* we may believe that all systems are to lose their identity and the better factors will be fused into some new and perfect system of religion, embodying the strong points of all, and discarding the weak points of all. In this view Christianity would lose itself in some larger unity or synthesis. This would be electicism, which we have also discarded. Or, *thirdly,* we may believe that other faiths will undergo a revision and cast off the objectionable features, and transmute their best under the influence of Christianity into something very like

to Christianity, but still retain their essential features and their names. We could rejoice in even such an outcome as this. If we are seeking to impart a spirit, rather than to formally proselytize, we might well feel that this goal was sufficient. If we care more about a spirit than a name, we might be satisfied with this result. It might be admitted that the trends one can see at the present time in India or China point to some such conclusion. Yet, as indicated above in discussing the aim of interpenetration, there may well be misgivings about accepting this as a final goal of our endeavours. It is certainly a fact that other systems are rapidly accepting much in Christianity and trying to build it into their systems, and even to claim these elements as original features of their various systems. In the end, we shall probably not be able to accept this as the final aim and goal of the Christian movement in the world, however attractive it may be. Or *fourthly*, we may believe that other systems will be fulfilled in Christianity and eventually lose themselves in Christianity, even as the religions of the empire did in the first Christian centuries; or as Judaism was fulfilled in Christianity, and in reality lost itself in the new religion. Professor J. N. Farquhar has expressed the idea that Christianity is the Crown of Hinduism. He expects to see Hinduism die into Christianity. Here the central idea is that Christianity is the one complete and perfect religion. Other systems are incomplete and inadequate, and must find supplement, completion, and fulfilment in Christianity.

Christians believe that religious evolution came to its maximum height in Jesus Christ, and that He is a religious finality, as shown elsewhere in this volume. All other systems are partial and incomplete, however

much truth they may possess. That there is here an unproved assumption we have to admit. That such a bias, if it be bias, is natural to us as Christians we must admit. However, as indicated elsewhere, there is much substantial evidence in proof, though such evidence may not be final to other religionists. History surely gives ground for such a view and the hope of final conquest built upon it. Jesus indicated the view here taken in referring to Judaism. "I am not come to destroy but to fulfil." This is the view we take as to the relation of Christianity to other religions. We admit that it is a hard doctrine for Buddhists, Mohammedans, or Confucians. However, if we love truth and care for truth alone, and are willing to give up pride, all religionists may find consolation in this view. If we primarily care for the finest and best in religion, and the purest embodiment of religion yet seen in the world, we must turn to Christ and Christianity. We must, as Christians, Moslems, Hindus or Buddhists be willing to sit at His feet. That all the world will yet do this is the faith of some of us today. That the races will yet come from the north and the south, the east and the west, to learn of Him seems a certainty. That the Oriental systems will find their fulfilment in the Christianity of Christ seems as probable as any yet unaccomplished goal can be.

All one can say here is that the situation in India, China and Japan is very similar to that existing in the Roman Empire during the first two Christian centuries. Many systems of religion mingled and flowed together, and struggled for supremacy, and out of that maelstrom of religious conflict, Christianity emerged victorious. It possessed the vital, dynamic, organizing centre of religions in that epoch. It finally embodied

much which had belonged to other systems. Some of these embodiments may be regarded as good and some as bad. Undoubtedly much which came into the life and practice of the Church was an adulteration. But the fact to keep in mind is that it was Christianity, out of a long list of competitors, which finally gained supremacy. Other systems in part were embodied in Christianity, but in a larger sense passed away. The inferior systems gave way before the superior system. The whole religious life of the peoples underwent a great change. A new era in religion was ushered in. Christianity dominated the situation.

Will this history be repeated in the Orient during the next century or two? Indications are not lacking that it will be so. However, no one dare prophesy. No one can do more than express an opinion at this point. The years will tell whether Christianity still possesses the spiritual dynamic for such conquest or not. It is the faith of some that it surely does possess the same spiritual power today which was so gloriously manifested in the first Christian centuries. We confidently preach " Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and to day and for ever."

Printed in the United States of America

CHARLES E. JEFFERSON, D.D., LL.D.

Five World Problems

$1.50

"Dr. Jefferson deals bravely, faithfully, and constructively with life and its problems. He writes frankly of imperialistic tendencies and the difficulties of racial conflict and the many disturbing factors of the Orient. He is balanced, just, serene and fair in every chapter. We commend this book unreservedly. It deserves a very wide reading."—*Church Management.*

ARTHUR J. BROWN, D.D.

Japan in the World of Today

Illustrated, **$3.75**

Dr. Sidney L. Gulick says: "This is a work which no one can ignore who wishes to know and understand Japan as she is today. In the judgment of the writer no other single work compares with this for fullness of information, accuracy of statement and fairness of attitude."

MINGCHIEN JOSHUA BAU, Ph.D.

China and World Peace

$2.00

An invaluable work by Dr. Bau, leading Chinese writer and teacher of political science. A distinct contribution to an understanding of the seething, ambitious, forward-looking China of today, and of western hopes of yet greater missionary and commercial successes in the Orient.

J. LEIGHTON STUART, D.D., LL.D.

The Chinese Mind and the Gospel

$1.50-$1.75

What can cure the ills of war-torn China? Are the New Intellectuals and the flaming Nationalists of that Oriental republic, likely to respond to the Gospel Panacea? These timely questions are at the heart of this thoughtful work by the president of Yenching (Peking) University. An up-to-the-minute book by a man who is there and knows.

ROBERT N. McLEAN, D.D.

That Mexican!

A Study of America's Next-Door Neighbor. Illustrated, **$2.00**

"The complete story of present-day characters and situations under the flag of our southern neighbor in an intensely interesting new book. The mortal ills of Juan Garcia, are set forth in detail. His love of beauty, his genius for art and for music, his courage in the face of long odds—the better side of Juan's character are adequately presented."—*Spokane Chronicle.*

ALEX. RATTRAY HAY

The Indians of South America and the Gospel

Illustrated, **$1.50**

Mr. Hay writes from personal knowledge, as a long-time missionary of the Inland South America Missionary Union. He tells of the mental and spiritual needs of the eight millions of neglected Indians who live in all parts of South America, and of the gratifying results of missionary work that is being done among them, particularly by the Missionary Union.

MELVIN GROVE KYLE, D.D., LL.D.

Explorations at Sodom

Ancient Sodom in the Light of Modern Research. Illustrated, **$1.50**

"The author has become, through the years, one of our most famous archæologists. He has had opportunity to do considerable research work in the regions of the Dead Sea. His story, as contained in this volume, reads like a romance. A remarkable piece of work."—*Western Christian Advocate.*

A. EUGENE BARTLETT

Out-of-the-Way Places in Europe

A New Idea Travel Guide-Book. Illustrated, **$1.50**

"This book is just what it claims to be. It is not the ordinary travel book, for it deals with places never seen by the ordinary traveler. Mr. Bartlett has gone to out-of-the-way places and his words make us wish that he had taken us with him."—*Watchman-Examiner.*

Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries
1 1012 01234 0727

Date Due

N 13 '39
D 1 '39
Ap 15 '41
Ap 20 '43
MY 17'48
FE 16'51
JUN 25 2007

Z. Miss. Pe.

Work
New era
in missions.